

ganic Act; to the Committee on the Territories.

2786. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Harrison, of East St. Louis, Ill., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, relative to the exploitation of the men in the United States Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2787. Petition of the City Council of the City of Toledo, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6955; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1942

Rev. William H. Pinkerton, D. D., pastor of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we always are shocked and stand in awe when we remember that we are in the midst of Thy all-pervading presence, and when we unseal our lips and speak to the Almighty God; but, when we remember that we are Thy offspring, we nestle to Thy heart as children and feel the consciousness of Thy nearness and Thy fatherly love.

There is a dart of pain in the heart of every Member of the Senate, no doubt, and in our own heart when we think of that eminent clergyman, that genial friend and companion, the man who was Chaplain of this Senate for so many years and who directed the uplift of the eye and the outreach of the heart of the Members of this body to Thee, and asked upon them the blessing of God.

We pray, O God, today that Thou wilt extend Thy leading hand to the President of the United States and to the Vice President who presides over this body; and we pray that all of their councilors, Thy councilors, may somehow have a consciousness of the brooding presence of God in their minds and hearts.

We pray for this body, which is probably the most responsible and most important body of organized legislators in the world today. We pray that in their minds and hearts there may come the quickening inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, to the end that the wisdom and justice and will of God may be embraced in the enactments of this distinguished body, the Senate of the United States. We ask for Thy blessing in the name of Him who was our Lord and Master. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 11, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 11, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine; and

S. 2315. An act for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6362. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; and

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfstein, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odum;

H. R. 3572. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 1529 (a));

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Westlie A. Coulter, Sr.;

H. R. 5468. An act for the relief of J. Furman Richardson;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6374. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942;

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chandler	Holman
Andrews	Chavez	Hughes
Austin	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.
Ball	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Bankhead	Downey	La Follette
Barkley	Doxey	Langer
Bilbo	George	Lee
Bone	Gerry	McCarran
Brooks	Gillette	McFarland
Brown	Glass	McKellar
Bulow	Green	McNary
Bunker	Guffey	Maloney
Burton	Gurney	Maybank
Butler	Hatch	Millikin
Byrd	Hayden	Murdock
Capper	Herring	Murray
Caraway	Hill	Norris

Nye	Russell	Tunnell
O'Daniel	Schwartz	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Smathers	Vandenberg
Overton	Smith	Van Nuys
Radcliffe	Spencer	Wagner
Reed	Stewart	Wheeler
Reynolds	Taft	White
Rosier	Thomas, Okla.	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Indiana and New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

A petition of sundry citizens of Georgetown, Harbeson, Lewes, and Milton, in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Iowa and Pittsburgh, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Maryland and West Virginia, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—MEMORIALS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I present memorials signed by citizens of the State of Wisconsin, numbering 4,827, in opposition to Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill, and House bill 4000, bills in relation to the liquor traffic in the vicinity of military camps, and so forth, which I ask may be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions unanimously adopted by the Center Hill Farmers Union, Local No. 1147, Riley County, Kans., at its recent meeting in Randolph, Kans., protesting against the use of liquor in the military camps and urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill, with a view to correcting existing conditions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas according to first-hand reports, deplorable conditions exist in and around our military training camps due to vice and alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas these moral evils are undermining the physical and spiritual strength of our manpower, thus greatly lowering the effectiveness of our armed forces and endangering the security of our Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved,

(1) That we urge you as our spokesman in the United States Senate to lend your influence and vote toward the immediate enactment of the now pending Sheppard bill, S. 860;

(2) That further steps be taken to prevent the drinking of alcoholic beverages within our training camps; and

(3) That now existing laws prohibiting vice and drunkenness be more strictly enforced.

Whereas necessary limitations have been placed upon many commodities; and

Whereas the use of sugar, and sugar-yielding products, is still permitted for the manufacture of beverage alcohol: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we urge upon the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Production Manager, Donald M. Nelson, that they take immediate steps toward the prohibition of the manufacture of all beverage alcohol, thus conserving essential products for our united war effort.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from Norfolk, Va., dated March 11, 1942, which reads as follows:

NORFOLK, VA., March 11, 1942.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military
Affairs Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I am writing to you, not personally, but officially, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

At a union service of the representatives of the Methodist churches of Norfolk, Va., at Colonial Avenue Methodist Church, the congregation requested the pastor of the church to write to you stating that those present desire you to present to the Senate of the United States the action of the congregation in favor of the prompt passage of Senate bill No. 860, or protective legislation for our soldiers from the liquor and vice traffic similar to that which was enacted in 1917.

You are also requested to present this action to the Senate that it may be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

JOHN F. OWENS, Pastor.

I also have a letter from C. S. Longacre, of Takoma Park, Washington, D. C., general secretary of the American Temperance Society, which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD, together with a brief petition, without all the names attached, which he sends.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and petition, without all the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY
OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS,
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.,
March 22, 1942.

The Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: With this I am enclosing a petition from citizens of Henderson County, N. C., requesting Congress to pass S. 860, known as the Sheppard bill, to restrict the sale and use of liquor in and around our Army camps, and also to banish vice from the areas surrounding the camps.

I wish you would kindly have the petition mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then sent to the committee that has this bill under consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

C. S. LONGACRE.

PETITION TO UNITED STATES SENATE

A petition in favor of the immediate passage of S. 860, known as the Sheppard bill, which aims to safeguard the health, welfare, and safety of soldiers in the Army camps from being exploited by vice mongers and debauched with liquor and beer.

We, the undersigned adult citizens of Henderson County, State of North Carolina, respectfully request your honorable body to pass S. 860 or any similar legislation.

Mr. and Mrs. FRED SEGO.

Mr. and Mrs. D. A. REED.

(And sundry other citizens of North Carolina).

Mr. REYNOLDS. In connection with these communications I wish to say that I was honored at my office this morning by a call in person from Bishop Adna Wright Leonard and Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, the latter the general secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, who discussed with me the all-important subject of the traffic in liquor and vice in the respective communities where military camps are located. They furnished me with a report

of their observations and the information they had received relative to that matter.

These gentlemen also brought to my attention a copy of the Federal Council Bulletin, the issue of April 1942, and asked that I bring to the attention of the Members of this body, on page 10, an article entitled "Actions of Executive Committee," which reads as follows:

ACTIONS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The following resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches on March 13 are called to the attention of the churches for their careful consideration:

"a. Concerning vice and liquor:

"Whereas the biennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, held in Atlantic City, N. J., in December 1940, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the National Selective Service Act now in operation will call up millions of young men for training in military camps and naval stations; and

"Whereas during the World War the Selective Service Act of 1917 set up effective procedures on the part of our Government for protecting the young men in the national service from being exploited by the liquor traffic and by commercialized vice, prohibiting the sale of intoxicants to any man in the uniform of the Army or the Navy of the United States, and throwing a zone of 10 miles around the training camps as a protection against organized vice: Be it

"Resolved, That we call upon the President of the United States and upon the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to take such action as will secure the fullest possible moral and health protection for our soldiers and sailors."

"Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America reiterates the action taken by the Federal council in December 1940, as indicated above, and hereby calls upon the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as will give to our armed forces protection from the liquor and commercialized vice traffics in order that the physical and moral welfare of our armed forces may be safeguarded and national defense be promoted.

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to present this action to the Military Affairs Committees of the House and of the Senate of the United States and advocate prompt protective action; and be it further

"Resolved, That communities adjacent to Army camps and naval bases and the churches throughout the country be urged to cooperate in securing necessary measures and in making them effective.

"b. Concerning Japanese evacuated from west coast areas:

"Resolved, That the executive committee authorize an appeal to the pastors of Protestant churches throughout those areas in the West not affected by the present evacuation order, to discover through their congregations whether employment can be provided on farms and in homes and in other occupations for American citizens of Japanese ancestry who by Government order are being removed from designated areas along the Pacific coast, it being understood that the churches in areas now being evacuated will undertake to interview and recommend suitable persons for such positions as may be opened."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letters and petition presented by the Senator from North Carolina will lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2248) to amend

the law relating to the care and custody of insane residents of Alaska, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1322) thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE— INCREASED USE OF INLAND WATER- WAYS FOR TRANSPORTATION PUR- POSES

Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 241) to investigate whether the use of inland waterways for the transportation of petroleum products and other commodities may be increased (submitted by Mr. MAYBANK on April 30, 1942), reported it with an amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2521. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. REED:

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the more effective prosecution of the war by expediting the loading and unloading of railroad freight cars; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REGISTRATION OF LABOR ORGANIZA- TIONS, ETC.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. In connection with the resolution I present a press release or statement, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred as requested by the Senator from North Carolina, and, without objection, the press statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) requiring the registration of labor organizations, prohibiting the employment of certain persons as officers or agents of such organizations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The press statement released today by Mr. REYNOLDS is as follows:

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS (Democrat, North Carolina) today introduced in the Senate a joint resolution requiring the registration of labor organizations, prohibiting the employment of certain persons as officers or agents of such organizations, and for other purposes.

The Senator's joint resolution requires labor organizations to register with the Secretary of Labor and at the same time providing the Secretary of Labor with—

1. The name of the labor union or other labor organization;
2. The address at which it has its principal office or does business;
3. The names, titles, and salaries of its officers;

4. The initiation fees charged each member;
5. The annual dues charged each member;
6. The assessments levied against its members during the past 12-month period;
7. The limitations on membership;
8. The number of paid-up members;
9. The date of the last election of officers;
10. The method of election of officers;
11. The vote for and against each candidate for office at any election held during the past 12-month period; and
12. The date of the last detailed financial statement furnished to all members and the method of publication or circulation of such statement.

In addition thereto, the Senator's proposed legislation would prohibit labor unions from employing as officers or agents or representatives anyone other than an American citizen, and specifically are barred Communists, Fascists, or members of any Nazi Bund organization.

The Senator asked that this joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and stated that he hoped to be able to procure early hearings thereupon.

In commenting upon this joint resolution the Senator said: "I have always been the friend of organized labor; I am now its friend. I believe the very best thing that could be done for labor now would be to require their registration with the Government in order that the members of these various organizations may know just what is being done with the moneys that pass into their respective unions by way of initiation fees and dues. Why shouldn't they have the benefit of that information? In addition to that, during these perilous times when we must scrutinize every person engaged in the war effort, certainly anyone other than an American citizen, and certainly no American citizen who belongs to the Nazi Bund or the Fascist or Communist Party, should be permitted to serve as a representative of a labor organization. To use the words of Attorney General Biddle, who recently said: 'As long as there are leaders in the labor union whose integrity is questionable, unionism in general will be in danger. There will always be articulate enemies of labor ready to pounce upon the activities of dishonest labor leaders and exploit such evidence, however isolated it may be in an effort to give the impression that all unions are led by racketeers, and that labor in general is selfish and unreliable.'

"Attorney General Biddle is absolutely right, and this is one of the reasons why the labor organizations themselves should not only be willing to go on record as to their financial activities, etc., but should know that none of their officers other than American citizens of good character are so appointed, and not affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi organization. Of course, there are a lot of differences now between labor and capital, but my opinion is that labor and capital should to a large extent forget their differences for the time being and await the settlement of them until after the expiration of this war, because the thing desired by all now is unity and victory.

"I am in high hopes that the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate will give prompt consideration to my resolution, and I shall be disappointed if I do not have the wholehearted support of labor itself, because this legislation is designed for the benefit of labor, which is being so severely criticized now."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6362. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; and

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

INCREASED PENSIONS TO WORLD WAR VETERANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4845) to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$20 to \$40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUB- LIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 245), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys is hereby authorized to employ, beginning June 1, 1942, for the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress, an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,880 per annum.

RUSSIAN WAR RELIEF—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Russian Relief delivered by Senator MURRAY on April 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BROWN ON PRICE CONTROL AND INFLATION

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on price control and inflation delivered by him on May 11, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. PHILLIPS BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle entitled "Beloved in Life, Beloved in Death," in tribute to the late Dr. Z. Barney T. Phillips, Chaplain of the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FALL OF CORREGIDOR—EDITORIAL FROM MONTANA STANDARD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Montana Standard relating to the fall of Corregidor, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOME FRONT—TEXAS STYLE: ARTICLE BY ERSKINE CALDWELL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the magazine of the Sunday Washington Star of May 10, 1942, entitled "Home Front—Texas Style," which appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 210—REGULATION OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 65, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in enrolling S. 210, an act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to strike out the word "fifteen" in section 409 (a) (7) contained therein and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution. I will state for the benefit of the Senate that a few typographical errors were called to our attention by the Interstate Commerce Commission just after Senate bill 210 was passed, and the concurrent resolution is for the purpose of correcting those errors.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and was agreed to.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article from the Knoxville Journal of May 8, 1942, which purports to quote the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. Lilienthal, to the effect that the amendment which was adopted by the Senate recently, and which was so controversial, in nowise affects the Tennessee Valley Authority. I should like to read the article into the Record. The headline reads:

Tennessee Valley Authority safe, declares Lilienthal. Friends of agency told legislation not too serious.

This is an Associated Press report, under the date line of Chattanooga, Tenn., May 7. The article reads:

"Friends of the Tennessee Valley Authority should not take 'too seriously' legislation passed in the Senate Wednesday relating to certain aspects of the agency's financial control," Board Chairman David E. Lilienthal said here tonight.

Addressing one in a series of mass meetings of Tennessee Valley Authority employees, Lilienthal declared that when the excitement and hubbub attending the Senate action has died away, there still will be a Tennessee Valley Authority, serving the people of the country.

Lilienthal departed from his prepared text to discuss passage of the legislation, sponsored in the Senate by Senator McKellar (Democrat, Tennessee). He did not once mention the name of Tennessee's senior Senator, however.

The Tennessee Valley Authority's governing policy in selection of its personnel always has been the rule of merit rather than the rule of political reliability, he declared.

"The Tennessee Valley Authority has stood on merit all the 9 years of its existence despite the efforts of some to force us to do otherwise," he asserted.

Lilienthal said there was one point on which all participants of the Senate debate were in agreement, "that the Tennessee Valley Authority has become one of the principal weapons of warfare for us."

I merely desire to have in the Record this article from so high an authority as the chairman of the T. V. A., for the purpose of allaying any anxiety which may exist since the strenuous debate which took place in the Senate on the day the independent offices appropriation bill was passed. I think everyone will now feel that T. V. A. is safe.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at this point, in connection with what the Senator from Tennessee has said, I wish to state that at the time this matter was brought up originally two amendments were contemplated, one presented by the committee, and another which was to be offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar]. Those two amendments, taken together, according to the T. V. A., and in the judgment of

those of us who agreed with their construction, would have been harmful, but the one which was adopted without the other did not create the difficulty which the two together might have caused.

I think Mr. Lilienthal's purpose was to reassure the people in the Tennessee Valley who desire to make contracts with the T. V. A. that the particular amendment agreed to was not as harmful as the two together might have been.

In that connection, during the discussion of the subject the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] called the attention of the Senate to the fact that among the advertisements which had been placed in the newspapers was one in the Louisville Courier-Journal. I did not have information as to the facts with respect to that, but I assumed at the time that it was an advertisement similar to one I exhibited to the Senate urging the consumers of electric power to economize.

I have a letter from Mr. Mark Ethridge, who is the vice president and general manager of the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, calling attention to the fact that this advertisement, which appeared in full page form on May 25, 1941, was signed by all the Federal agencies involved, as well as all the power producers in that region, all of them urging economy in the consumption of power by their respective consumers.

That advertisement was signed by the Federal Power Commission, United States Office of Production Management, United States War Department, Tennessee Valley Authority, Alabama Power Co., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., and South Carolina Power Co. They all joined in the advertisement.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter from Mr. Ethridge and the full-page advertisement referred to be placed in the Record at this point in order that the matter may be cleared up.

There being no objection, the letter and the advertisement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE COURIER-JOURNAL,
THE LOUISVILLE TIMES,
Louisville, Ky., May 9, 1942.

The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I note that Senator McKellar, in listing advertisements that had been run by the Tennessee Valley Authority, cited the Courier-Journal. I am enclosing for your information a page from the paper of the date on which the ad appeared.

You will observe that it is signed by four Government agencies and five private power companies. Although the ad was placed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, I imagine it was a cooperative proposition to which all the signers contributed.

I don't know whether you want to do anything with it or not, but I thought you might like the truth about it.

Sincerely yours,

MARK ETHRIDGE.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 25, 1941]

AN APPEAL TO ALL USERS OF ELECTRIC LIGHT,
HEAT, AND POWER

The national defense program calls for an all-time high in production. Production of

raw materials, aluminum, steel, and finished products must go forward on an unheard-of scale.

The southeastern area is a large contributor to this defense production. In addition, the area has been chosen for the location of many Army cantonments, air-training bases, munitions plants, and other defense facilities. These defense activities require a great volume of power. The continued supply of this power throughout the emergency must not be interrupted or curtailed. This year an unprecedented drought threatens that power supply throughout the Southeast.

Large additions to power supply for the region are now under top-speed construction by Tennessee Valley Authority and private companies. They are nearing completion. But until these new sources of supply are actually delivering power, and especially during the next few months, it is imperative in the interest of defense that power be carefully conserved.

Even if normal rainfall should end the drought, you will still be asked not to waste power. For every kilowatt-hour you conserve at this time adds that much to the Nation's capacity for defense.

The Federal Power Commission and the public and private power agencies in the area are cooperating on improved arrangements for interchange between the several systems in order to make every potential kilowatt-hour available. But this may not prove enough to meet the emergency.

The undersigned governmental agencies and companies therefore, appeal to the public to join immediately in a voluntary campaign of economy in the use of electricity. Such economy of use is a patriotic necessity.

If the arrangements for interchange of power are successful in making larger supplies of electricity available, and the response to this appeal is sufficiently general and spontaneous, further drastic curtailment may be long postponed or, perhaps, forestalled altogether.

Your cooperation is needed.

Federal Power Commission, United States Office of Production Management, United States War Department, Tennessee Valley Authority, Alabama Power Co., Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., South Carolina Power Co.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, I have no objection to the matter referred to being printed in the Record, but I wish to ask the Senator if he knows who paid for the advertisement?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not.

Mr. McKellar. Inasmuch as the Senator placed the advertisement in the Record, will he be good enough to inquire who paid for it? I should like to know the pooling arrangements by which such advertisements were published.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the letter itself shows that the advertisement was carried to the Louisville Courier-Journal by the T. V. A. Whether there was any division of cost among those who signed the advertisement, I have no information.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. My information is that the advertisement which was signed by the Federal Power Commission, the O. P. M., the War Department, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and various power companies, was paid for by the power companies which supply the power to the particular section which the publication in question serves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no exact information on the subject, but I assume the cost would have been divided among those who inserted the advertisement.

Mr. NORRIS. The cost was divided between the different companies that advertised.

Mr. BARKLEY. Either equally or in proportion to their interests.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the cost was divided in proportion to the territory the various companies cover.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I do not know how the advertisement was paid for. There was a time when we could find out, but since the T. V. A. has gone into a pooling arrangement with the Alabama Power Co., the Mississippi Co., the Georgia Power Co., and all the power companies which we fought so vigorously many years ago in an effort to prevent them controlling the situation, it certainly is interesting to note that they are all joined together in this matter at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I imagine the advertisement cost all these power companies no more than it would have cost any one of them if it had taken a page advertisement.

Mr. NORRIS. The effect the advertisers wanted to bring about was curtailment of the use of electricity.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and because of that curtailment, in part at least, the O. P. M. was not required to carry out its order restricting the use of electric power.

Mr. NORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the fact that, in the interest of economy, these various producers of electricity joined in one advertisement indicates any invidious connection between them, or that the T. V. A. has been taken over by any of the private power companies that joined in an advertisement to urge their customers to reduce the consumption of electricity.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement issued yesterday by my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

I want to say to the people of Tennessee that there is no man on earth more for the Tennessee Valley Authority than I am. I have devoted a very large part of my public life to it. There is not a public man now living, as far as I can recall, who was for it in 1916 except Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, and myself. Senator NORRIS came into the picture several years afterward, in the early twenties.

President Roosevelt in January 1933 conceived the idea of having a Tennessee Valley Authority and having it build the dams which had theretofore been under the War Department. President Roosevelt directed the bill and it contained many of the provisions which I had in my bill and that Senator NORRIS had in his bill. The people of Tennessee should be, and I have no doubt feel themselves to be, under the greatest ob-

ligation to President Roosevelt for sponsoring the Tennessee Valley Authority dams. I feel under the greatest obligations to him on that account. I am for him now and have been for him all during the administration. I am for his war policies 100 percent and believe that we will win.

Of all the money spent on the Tennessee Valley Authority dams I have secured more than 90 percent of it, first from the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and then from the Congress. If I had not been on that committee, the Tennessee Valley Authority would not have received the money and most of the dams would not have been built, especially the Guntersville, Hiwassee, Chickamauga, Gilbertsville, Watts Bar, and Fort Loudon Dams. This will be established by any Senator who has served on the committee between 1933 and 1942. On many of the dams I got the bills through the Appropriations Committee by a very slender majority, sometimes by only 1 vote, once by a tie vote.

While I was obtaining the appropriations for these dams Lillenthal and A. E. Morgan were lobbying against the building of any more dams, just as Lillenthal has been here for the last week or 10 days lobbying against paying his receipts into the Treasury as other public power organizations do, and lobbying against obtaining his appropriations from the Congress. He wants to be free to spend the Government's money invested in those dams as he pleases, not as the Government which built the dams pleases.

Lillenthal last fall, on November 21, 1941, secured the passage of a law taking away from the General Accounting Office the power to audit his accounts or to interfere with his spending the money in any way. I did not know of the passage of the law, and I think the people will give me credit for usually knowing what is going on as to my State. The General Accounting Office has the power over the accounts of all other agencies of the Government and the duty to audit and investigate them, but under that law only Lillenthal passes upon the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Recently he got the Budget to recommend a law to create a revolving fund of his enormous receipts of something like \$25,000,000 a year to be spent as he sees fit without having to account to his Government therefor. We have several similar power organizations in the West. The law as to them read as follows:

"All receipts for transmission and sales of electric energy generated [at the dam projects] . . . shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

Why should Lillenthal be excused from this just and honest method of transacting the Government's business?

Lillenthal, since his election as Chairman of the Authority, has changed his character of "Uriah Heep" to an "American Hitler." He is now undertaking to run the Tennessee Valley Authority as he sees fit, without regard to law, justice, or right and fair dealing.

Talking about his being for the war effort. He is selling power to the Milan plant and the Tullahoma plant at a higher rate than he is selling to municipalities in Tennessee. He is profiteering on the Government, and notably tried to profiteer with regard to the TNT plant at Chattanooga when he was caught in the act and the War Department would not give him the contract.

He has over a thousand private passenger automobiles in his plant, the running of which cost \$324,000 last year. His travel pay last year exceeded \$2,000,000, including train, passenger automobile, and plane.

He got a law passed in some way taking private citizen's property by a commission instead of by a jury, as guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. He pays the commission \$15 a day and \$5 a day as subsistence.

Thus, they become his paid agents passing upon the value of private citizens' property.

He has become an ardent advocate of the private power companies and has pooled the Tennessee Valley Authority with eight or nine private power companies.

The Constitution of the United States prohibits money from being paid out of the Treasury of the United States except by congressional appropriation. Under these circumstances I ask the people of Tennessee why should this "American Hitler" be permitted to evade the Constitution of the United States and to run roughshod over the people of Tennessee?

The people of Tennessee must not be misled. The Tennessee Valley Authority will go on even under Lillenthal until his term ends, and thereafter, without the "sacred cow," it will continue in much larger measure to bless the people of the State and of the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6293, to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have, of course, no objection to the consideration of the measure. Is the Senator from Vermont going to explain the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to ask one question before the Senator proceeds.

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall be very glad to answer.

Mr. McNARY. When the bill was brought before the Senate a week or two ago I offered an amendment on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who is absent from the Senate, which provided that there should be no prejudice against anyone on account of race or color. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont if that amendment is incorporated in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, it is not. It was considered by the committee. It was part of the Thomas amendment, to which it had been attached by the action of the Senate. The whole Thomas amendment, as so amended, was considered by the committee, and the committee decided, after hearings, instead of reporting the Thomas amendment, as amended, to report House bill 6293 in exactly the same words in which it came to the Senate. The reason for that will probably be disclosed later. Perhaps it is not necessary to state the reason at this time in my answer.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with the expeditious

disposal of the bill. I only regret that the amendment is not in the Senate committee version of the bill; but I understand the able Senator from Vermont is anxious to have the bill passed by the Senate as it passed the House, in order to avoid the necessity of having a conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I hope that some other bill which may be considered in the future may contain the provision to which I have referred.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the principle involved in the amendment to which the leader of the minority refers has my approval. I have supported it on other occasions in the Senate, and helped to have it incorporated in a bill which became Public, No. 783, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, on September 16, 1940. That is the existing law, and it declares the policy of Congress perfectly clear in this proviso to section 4 (a):

Provided, That in the selection and training of men under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

Congress had theretofore declared its policy in that respect in Public, No. 18, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, approved April 3, 1939. Congress undertook to provide for having young colored men made ready for training in the Air Corps by section 4 of that act, as follows:

Sec. 4. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion and under rules, regulations, and limitations to be prescribed by him, to lend to accredited civilian aviation schools, one or more of which shall be designated by the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the training of any Negro air pilot, at which personnel of the Military Establishment are pursuing a course of education and training pursuant to detail thereto under competent orders of the War Department, out of aircraft, aircraft parts, aeronautical equipment and accessories for the Air Corps, on hand and belonging to the Government, such articles as may appear to be required for instruction, training, and maintenance purposes.

That provision sets forth the policy expressed by Congress; but prior to that declaration of policy, the National Defense Act and other acts relating to the Military Establishment made no discrimination whatever on account of color or race between the men who might afterward enlist or be inducted under the Selective Service and Training Act. The policy of the War Department is, I think, expressed in the development at Tuskegee of a school for the training of colored officers. This is an advancement which is praiseworthy and, I understand, has been successful.

So there is nothing about the attitude of the Military Affairs Committee in reporting House bill 6293 without amendment which could by implication be regarded as a denial of the amendment to which the Senator from Oregon has referred. There is in fact nothing in the action of the committee which undertakes to reverse or derogate the policy of Congress with respect to the subject matter of the amendment. There is a good reason for the action taken by the committee, which I shall explain later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Vermont for the statement which he has just made. As the Senator knows, I offered an amendment to House bill 6293 when it was previously under consideration, having in mind the purpose behind the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. When the bill went to the committee I naturally supposed that my amendment would follow the bill to the committee, and would have consideration by the committee, and, since I am a member of the committee, I expected to participate in the consideration; but, unfortunately, as things happen in the Senate at times, a Senator would have to be three or four persons in order to attend the meetings of all committees of which he is a member, and on the particular day when the bill was considered in the committee, Friday, May 8, I was occupied in a committee which was considering the question of priorities in metals, which is a matter of vital concern and interest to the West, and so I could not be present at the meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs.

I understand from the Senator's remarks that these amendments were considered at the time the bill was reported by the committee, and were rejected.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think an unfolding of what occurred in the committee will show that the amendments were not rejected on the merits of the policy they represented. The report shows in two places that the committee considered them, as I shall point out. The introductory paragraph states:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States, having considered the same, together with a Senate-approved amendment offered on behalf of Mr. BARBOUR, an amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and certain amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. HUGHES, and by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that the bill H. R. 6293 in the form it passed the House of Representatives do pass without amendment.

In the last paragraph in the report I point out the following:

The amendment offered on behalf of Mr. BARBOUR and those intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. HUGHES, are substantially the same. Each provides that in the enrollment and appointment of women under this bill, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions thereof, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color. The bill, as now worded, does not discriminate against any person. The War Department has stated that this corps, if authorized, will include Negro units and the record of that Department with respect to the employment of Negroes in and with the Army does not justify an assumption that such discrimination will be exercised in the administration of the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That language is explicit; but I have read the

statements of Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, and of General Marshall, Chief of Staff, and I do not find any mention of the matter in their statements. I notice that the report states:

The War Department has stated that this corps, if authorized, will include Negro units—

And so forth. Where is that statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is in the hearings. There have been three sets of hearings: One in the House Committee on Military Affairs on the House bill; one in the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate on the Senate bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], which differs only in two very minor respects from the House bill; and the third on the recommitment of the bill to the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator understand that in those hearings the War Department made the statement that there would be no discrimination of any kind?

Mr. AUSTIN. I so understand. I shall put the statement in the RECORD so that it may appear in connection with my remarks.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I can put it in the RECORD. At the last hearing which was held, the Senator from Vermont asked Mrs. Mankin, of Georgia, the following question when General Hilldring was present:

May I ask if you would favor attaching to the House bill the amendment of Senator BARBOUR?

The language of the amendment was stated, and Mrs. Mankin said that she thought it was needless, and that it raised questions which ought not to be raised, because there was no intention on the part of the Army to discriminate against anyone because of race, creed, or color.

Mr. President, without taking further time, I ask unanimous consent that so much of the testimony as pertains to this question be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It will definitely show that General Hilldring and others who appeared before the committee suggested that in their opinion this amendment ought not to be adopted because it was not necessary.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. MANKIN. Now, gentlemen, I have not presented what I had to say very well, but the thought that I want to leave with you is this. If it is a question of the bill that was presented in the House as Mrs. ROGERS' bill, and that has come to you, if it is a question of passing it without an amendment or defeating the bill, I say pass the bill, because I know a great deal of good can be done.

Gentlemen, there is one other point that I would like to bring up. That is, with reference to the corps enlisting both white and colored women.

I heard a little criticism from a friend of mine in the House, a friend from the South, on the subject of colored women. Gentlemen, remember this, that if this corps is going

to take over the Air Warning Service, this Air Warning Service does not extend just into the white districts of our cities. In Atlanta, we have a very large section, in fact, 40 percent, of colored.

Well, now, certainly, in those sections you should have colored air wardens, or colored women serving in this work. The white women should serve in the white section, and the colored women would be needed in this corps in many capacities.

The CHAIRMAN. In reference to that, it is my understanding that the Army has a perfect right to take in as many colored or white women as it desires; it is entirely voluntary.

General HILLDRING. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the bill, at the present time, of the 150,000, if they wanted to, they could take 125,000 colored and have the authority to take them anyway, if they wanted to, and place them in any position they wanted to, under the authority.

Mrs. MANKIN. Well, it seems to me that the Army is going to use its usual common sense in reference to that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mrs. MANKIN. And the Army is not going to do, in reference to white and colored women, any difference from what it is doing between white and colored men, and I do not see any danger there at all.

The CHAIRMAN. It is under the entire direction of the Army, without the amendment, because they have the authority.

Senator AUSTIN. May I ask you if you would favor attaching to the House bill the amendment of Senator BARBOUR?

Mrs. MANKIN. I am afraid I have not seen that amendment, sir.

Senator AUSTIN. That is where it says, on page 2, line 2, after the word "thousands", insert a colon and the following: "Be it provided that in the enrollment and appointment of women under this act and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

Mrs. MANKIN. Well, my opinion of that amendment is that it is absolutely unnecessary. If you do not have some confidence in your Army, this country is in a bad fix, and I cannot see how that amendment would do anything—well, it is just a lot of words.

Senator CHANDLER. In other words, is it your opinion that that raises a question that simply ought not to be raised?

Mrs. MANKIN. I think it does; it is needless. Senator CHANDLER. And ought not to be raised?

Mrs. MANKIN. It ought not to be because they are not going to be discriminated against.

Senator CHANDLER. The Army has the authority and power, and I believe they have the desire, to handle the situation correctly, and there is no need to meddle in it and raise this question of color. I do think the Army can do better about it than anybody else.

Mrs. MANKIN. If you are going to turn over to the Army the question of defense, then you should turn over to them the problem of deciding where they are going to put the colored and where they are going to put the white people.

Senator CHANDLER. And no one has a right to assume that the Army is any less interested in winning this war than anyone else.

Mrs. MANKIN. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand from the excerpt which the Senator has read from the hearings that he is quoting a Mrs. Mankin.

Mr. CHANDLER. She appeared in behalf of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But not on behalf of the War Department?

Mr. CHANDLER. The War Department officials were present. General Hilldring agreed to her statement. He was in accord with the statement which she made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the testimony show that he agreed, or is that merely her statement?

Mr. CHANDLER. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], said:

In reference to that, it is my understanding that the Army has a perfect right to take in as many colored or white women as it desires, it is entirely voluntary.

General HILLDRING. That is right.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am now able to turn to General Hilldring's testimony on this point.

I read from page 29 of the typewritten transcript of the hearing. The paging in the printed hearings will be different. General Hilldring said:

In regard to the amendment offered by Senator McNARY, the War Department feels that such amendment is unnecessary, that is, the selection of people without distinction as to race, creed, or color. The War Department intends, and has so stated in both hearings, to organize colored units for service at appropriate stations, but is opposed to any amendment which raises the question of discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

I know that there are other places in the record where such a statement is made, but this is explicit, and I suppose it is adequate.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. As I now understand the situation, there is no amendment before the Senate on the matter which has been discussed. Does the Senator from Oregon have an amendment to propose, or has it been withdrawn?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No amendment has as yet been proposed.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought probably we could get the matter before the Senate and clarify it if I should make the statement that I have an amendment which I propose to offer to the bill now or later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is now open to amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "thousand", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That in the enrollment and appointment of women under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of-

ferred by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, under other circumstances this amendment would have my support. I ask the sponsors of the amendment to stand by and support the bill because of the emergency and the need for prompt enactment of the bill. Moreover, the parliamentary situation is peculiar. The legislative history back of the bill gives a sound reason for adopting what the House passed without the change of a word. I shall try to state it.

The House passed House bill 6293, which creates a semimilitary status for the proposed Women's Corps. It would not be in the Army. It would be with the Army. If the bill should become a law the Women's Corps would be under the command of the Chief of Staff of the Army, who, of course, is subject to the orders of the President as Commander in Chief. The regulations for the proposed corps would be made by the Secretary of War, to be executed under the Chief of Staff through a woman director and her subordinate assistants.

The theory of the bill is wholly different from the incorporation into the Army itself of a Women's Corps. Nevertheless, within a short time after the adoption of the first theory, of a corps with the Army, but not in it, the House seemed to have reversed its policy, because it passed a bill providing for a Naval Auxiliary Women's Corps, the theory of which was that such a corps would have a full military status. So the parliamentary situation of one of the bodies of the Congress is that, on the one hand, it has adopted the theory of a corps which would have a semimilitary status, and, on the other hand, it has adopted the theory of a full military status for women.

What would happen to this bill now if we should amend it in respect to one word, so that it would go back to the House for consideration again? Would the House stand by its most recent theory, its most recent view of the status to be occupied by the women who are to be members of such a corps? If so, it would reverse the whole policy of the pending bill and give the Auxiliary Corps full military status instead of the semimilitary status for which the bill now provides. The substantial result of amending this bill cannot be forecast; but, again, there is another reason why amendment of this bill would be against the public interest. The officers of the Army, those who are in charge of the prosecution of the war, have for a long time urged upon Congress legislation of some sort which would enable them to bring under military discipline the women who now are mere volunteers, not subject to any regulation, not subject to any limitation upon their conduct, who have no term of service, and are without responsibility and without reliability. I do not derogate the very excellent spirit of the members of these voluntary corps—and there are many of them in our large cities—nor do I question that they have done excellent service where they are established. But war has not yet

touched them directly. They have not yet been called upon to remain on duty for any definite or permanent length of time, nor have they yet been asked to submit to regulations and to military discipline, which are absolutely essential to the prosecution of a military effort. The War Department realizes that we may at any time have use for such organizations as those which now are set up on the Pacific coast, to operate under very strict discipline and regulations and to obey orders, rather than to do that which they so beautifully offer to do, and which they are eager to do, as volunteer patriots.

There is great need for immediate passage of some such law. On the last occasion, when representatives of the Army were sent here to testify about amendments to the bill, they repeatedly said that, although they had a preference, it made little difference whether the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was in or with the Army, so far as the policy of government is concerned, but it did make a great difference whether this bill became a law promptly or whether it dragged through a process of reconsideration, as it has already done. So the Army took the position, "We need this corps so badly that we leave it up to Congress, of course, to take such procedure as will assure the prompt enactment of a law on the subject."

I might refer to the testimony of General Hildring with respect to the need.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator prefer not to be interrupted until after he shall have concluded his statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am entirely satisfied to yield at any time.

Mr. MALONEY. Then I should like to ask the Senator a few questions, if I may. Can the able Senator from Vermont tell us the origin of the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. The only origin I know is Mrs. ROGERS, who represents a district of Massachusetts in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MALONEY. I am prompted to ask the question because the Senator has said time and again that the Army is extremely anxious to have this proposal enacted immediately, and that there is danger in delay.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. I am wondering why, after all the years of the experience of the Army, that its leaders did not earlier think about this matter. I make this observation upon the assumption that the Senator is correct in assuming that the proposal originated in the House of Representatives.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, I should not undertake to state why the Army has not thought about the matter. However, there is evidence of persons other than Mrs. ROGERS thinking of this subject, and some of that evidence pertains to officers in the Army. I recall one who was formerly in the Army, but who now is in the Veterans' Administration, who told of his experience in World War No. 1 with what was called the W. A. A. C., a

women's organization under the British set-up; and it had occurred to him that we should be at work to provide such an institution here. That testimony is in the record of the hearings.

Mr. MALONEY. The hearings, I understand, have not been printed, or made available to Senators; is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Some of them have, and the testimony of that person is in the House hearings of January 20 and 21, 1942.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Can the Senator tell us whether or not it is contemplated that these women will be sent beyond the boundaries of the United States?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; the Senator from Vermont can state that it is.

Mr. MALONEY. It is so contemplated?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. Can the Senator tell us whether or not, under the language of the bill, it would be possible to send the women into the front lines—not as fighting soldiers; I do not mean that; but in connection with their duties?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; the Senator can state that that is not contemplated. It would not be permitted by the proposed act.

Mr. MALONEY. But it is contemplated to send these women into foreign fighting zones; is it not?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. The word "fighting" is the word which makes me say "No." They cannot be put into a place of combat.

Mr. WHEELER. What is the language in the bill to prevent it?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, in the first place, the very first page, in lines 5 and 6, contains the words "for noncombatant service."

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; noncombatant service means that they are not fighting; but that does not answer the question of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; that is not a correct interpretation of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. I am prepared to pursue that point, if I may do so.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I ask the Senator to excuse me.

Mr. MALONEY. I think the bill quite clearly provides that the women may not be assigned to combatant service, but it seems to me that the bill permits them to serve in combat zones and to be sent to the front lines. They cannot be compelled to fight; but that is the only limitation that I find in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think that the Senator from Connecticut has not correctly interpreted the bill, if he assumes that it means that they can be sent into the front-line trenches, or even near them.

A question was asked on that point. There were some members of the committee who favored that idea and purpose, and, therefore, at the outset, and on principle, favored the amendment which would incorporate them into the Army, so that they could be put into that kind of dangerous position. The officers

testifying, Brigadier General Hildring and Lieutenant Colonel Swift, denied that that was the purpose of the bill, or within its power.

Then the question arose: Suppose that a corps that is employed in a filter station on the Pacific coast should be swept over by a flight of attacking bombers; would not the women in that corps be in a danger zone? Would not they be in a combat zone? The officers testifying answered, of course, "Yes."

Mr. MALONEY. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt, let me say that there is quite a difference between being sent into a combat zone and having the combat zone moved in on one.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. Would the Senator himself object to the inclusion, on page 1, line 6, after the words "United States," of the following language: "Within the boundaries of the United States?"

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I should. I should object to it on principle, and I should also object to it on the ground that this proposed legislation would be delayed, and we do not know what would be the result of such delay.

Mr. MALONEY. I can understand the Senator's anxiety about delay; but if it is not intended to send these women into foreign fighting zones, and the Congress does not desire that the Army have the authority to send them into foreign fighting zones, I think it is important that the Congress say so while it here has the chance.

Mr. AUSTIN. Even with the amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, the Congress would not be saying so. The Congress would be saying much more than that.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not heard the entire discussion; but I should like to know what is the estimated cost of this program?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is a question I cannot answer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the committee had no evidence on that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think not. We have had evidence with respect to the pay table.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the time come when cost is totally immaterial?

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, hardly that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It seems that way, if the committee took no account at all of the cost.

Mr. AUSTIN. Although it often seems that the sums of money here involved are very great, yet we are more concerned in prosecuting this war to victory than we are in haggling over the cost of the maintenance of an Auxiliary Corps of 150,000 members. The pay table for the members of this corps is fixed, and they are payable in fixed wages. The wages appear in the bill, so that any Senator can make an estimate.

The Senator from Ohio suggests that in the report of the committee on page 4 there will be found a paragraph in the

form of a letter from the Secretary of War to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, reading as follows:

The additional cost of this legislation cannot be determined at this time. It is estimated at approximately \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year 1942 and will probably be less than a military organization of the same size.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for assisting me at that point.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. There is an interesting thing about this bill appearing on page 9, and which, while trivial in one aspect in comparison with the larger question of principle involved, nonetheless intrigues me. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two with reference to the language in lines 14 to 25, inclusive.

The provision referred to reads:

In the event any member of the corps dies during her period of enlistment or appointment, the necessary expense for the recovery of the body, its preparation for burial, including the use of such of the uniform and articles of clothing issued to her as may be required, interment or cremation, and transportation of remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort to her home or the place where she received orders or enrolled or was appointed, or to such other place as her relatives may designate provided the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to her home, shall be paid by the United States.

Who decides whether there shall be burial, interment, or cremation of the remains of a volunteer who shall die while a member of the corps?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut is a veteran and knows from experience who decides such questions on the field of battle. Section 14 of the bill provides:

SEC. 14. The members of the corps shall be subject to such disciplinary regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, including provisions for the punishment of major infractions by summary discharge from the corps, and shall be subject to the Articles of War pursuant to the second article thereof when applicable.

Another section of the bill, to wit, section 2, the middle of the section, beginning in line 9, provides:

The Director, under the direction of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, shall advise the War Department on matters pertaining to the establishment of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; shall operate and administer the corps in accordance with normal military procedure of command and administration and such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

While standing on the floor it is difficult to find all the different places in the bill where similar provisions appear.

The Senator from Ohio has called my attention to section 13, which reads:

The Secretary is hereby authorized to prepare and issue any and all regulations, rules, or orders and to employ any and all of the facilities of the War Department and of the Army of the United States to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

In many places in the bill the policy is declared by Congress; so that it appears

that all questions, including those suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, will be decided according to the military method of decision.

If a death occurs on shore, say on the Pacific coast, in an area that is not a battle area, I presume there will be regulations to provide for the various contingencies. The members of this corps will have a quasi-military status and will be under regulations of the Secretary of War.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, I wish to have the Senator know that when he ascribed to me the status of a veteran, and thereupon imputed to me knowledge of Army rules and regulations which might determine who decides whether a member of this nonmilitary unit in case of death shall be cremated or not, I feel bound to disclaim any such extensive knowledge. It goes far beyond my status as a veteran, such as it is, and I will in that particular assert that I fought no more important battle than that of retaining Columbia, S. C., for Camp Jackson, which was a very important event, to be sure; but I acquired no special knowledge as a veteran on that account.

I will say further to the Senator from Vermont, if I may, that I know of no declaration by Congress with reference to the cremation of bodies of persons, whether in the Army or in noncombatant military service. I ask if the Senator from Vermont can point to any place in this bill which makes the noncombatant volunteers of the W. A. A. C. subject, in the event of death, to rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War? I should think merely to state the question would supply the answer.

I ask whether there is any protection afforded to, and whether members of the family, who are entitled under statutory laws of the State of residence to claim the bodies, will have some discretion as to whether the body of a volunteer shall be returned uncremated, if the Senator please. I point out that the Government went to very great expense in bringing back the bodies of thousands of veterans from France, and, I believe those that were left there were interred at the discretion and under permission of the families remaining in the United States. I know of no cremations.

I note that this legislative language states an alternative, and I should dislike to conceive that if, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has already suggested, the cost of this Women's Corps shall be considered too large, someone may say that the necessary expense involved in the recovery of a body, and its preparation for burial or interment becomes a factor of expense, and consequently order cremation on the ground that the necessary expense for cremation is very much less than the necessary expense for the recovery of a body and its preparation for burial. I think the family ought to be protected in some way, so far as it is possible.

Let me add, despite the claimed need for haste, after one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years without having any such legis-

lation as this, that on the next page the bill makes provision for those volunteers who come within the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as to whom the measure provides for the payment of funeral and burial expenses, and, in addition, "the Commission may embalm and transport the body, in a hermetically sealed casket if necessary, to the home of the member."

I think that suggests a possible discrimination. If a member dies during her period of enlistment or appointment she faces the possibility of cremation. If, on the other hand, she dies while she is within the purview of the statutes dealing with Employees' Compensation Commission administration, then she is entitled to a hermetically sealed casket. I should like to know who is to decide in such cases? Does not the Senator from Vermont think that perhaps we ought to clarify the bill in those particulars?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not think the bill needs any clarification; I think it is perfectly clear and harmonious in all its particulars. It is obvious to me, anyway, that it is the purpose to create this unit of a semimilitary character under the administration by the military branch of the Government, and the members of the organization will have just as humane treatment as the circumstances admit. In some circumstances cremation may be deemed to be necessary.

Mr. President, I do not intend to delay action on the pending amendment. I say I would vote for it under other circumstances, but it is my hope that we may pass this bill through the Senate without a change, without any amendment at all, and I shall vote against the amendment on that account. I asked those who are not present in the Chamber but who are outside the Chamber and showed an interest in it to remain and help secure the passage of the bill; but, no, they evidently decided not to do that, and, therefore, they will lose my support on this occasion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 1, line 6, after the name "United States", to insert the words "and within the boundaries of the United States."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should first state that I am opposed to the pending bill, but it seems to me that it is extremely important that if the bill is to be passed the enthusiastic and patriotic young women whom I anticipate will rush in great numbers to serve should be fully informed as to what they might be commanded to do.

We have already been advised by the distinguished and able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] that the bill will permit the military authorities to send the

young women of this auxiliary anywhere in the world; that they can be sent, although not as fighters, into the fighting places. No one has yet clearly stated, despite the fact that in one place or another the bill has been under consideration for a period of many months, what these women will be called upon to do. In the brief report submitted by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs it is suggested that they might be called upon to serve as airplane spotters, or in some similar capacity. The implication, as I read the report to the Senate, is that these women will serve in such capacities within the continental United States. It seems clear that they are not to be called upon to serve as cooks, but rather that they will be furnished with cooks from the male forces of our Army. It seems rather clear to me that they are not to do housekeeping about the camps, and there is indication, although not too clear, that they will be called upon for semicivilian duties at home—such clerical work, work as listeners, or perhaps on communication and similar detail.

Mr. President, I am rather amazed at the attitude of the Army for haste at this late date. I do not think the Army originated the idea, but 6 months after its introduction the Army decides that there is so much need for immediate action that the bill should not be changed to the extent of a single word. If, as many have been led to believe, these young women, upon the creation of this auxiliary, would serve only within the boundaries of the United States, this is the time and the place to so fix the policy.

I am not very optimistic about the chance of preventing the passage of the bill, but I should like to call the attention of Senators to the fact that, excepting here, and not very loudly and not from very many, there has been no strong clamor for the bill. There have been few, if any, witnesses coming to testify before the Senate committee urging its passage, and before it is passed, if it is to pass—I hope that the Members of the Senate will do what they can to make it sure that American women will not be sent into the far-away fighting places, under most uncertain circumstances and conditions.

For me, I do not want to see the bill passed at all. I think we can bring these patriotic American women into positions of importance where they may serve their country quite outside the Army. They can render the same kind of Army service women rendered during the last war, under civil service, and women who are called upon to serve as listeners in connection with the possibility of invasion, or as airplane spotters, can be depended upon, in my judgment, to render such service in a civilian capacity.

I cannot believe there is need to put these women under military authority in order that they may be commanded every hour of the day. I cannot quite see the wisdom of sending thousands of our young women into Army camps, even here at home. It seems to me that the least that might be said of the measure is that it casts a shadow over the sanctity of the home. Women so anxious to serve,

women burning with patriotism, as they are, will be afforded plenty of opportunity in civilian capacities to work in the defense plants of our country and thus permit young men physically fit to go into the armed forces.

I do not intend to delay the Senate, but I should like to urge upon Senators careful thought as to the seriousness of this step, never thought of before, to my knowledge, in all our history, never very carefully studied here, in my judgment, never very definitely explained by the military authorities, and, I say respectfully, not very clearly explained here, at least to me.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to say that I had the intention of explaining the bill, but before I could open my mouth the amendments were offered, and, of course, I am following the wishes of the Senate in this respect. If I have an opportunity, I shall explain the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if what I said in any way implied that the Senator from Vermont had not properly undertaken to explain the bill, I am sorry. I had proposed to wait until he had concluded, and I thought he had concluded. I early asked him if he preferred not to be interrupted until he had completed his statement, and he told me he welcomed interruptions. Then, of his own accord, as I understood, he surrendered the floor. But I certainly did not intend to suggest a criticism of the Senator in anything I said. I stated that the bill had not been clearly explained to me, that it was not clear what these women would be called upon to do if this Auxiliary Corps were created.

It is pretty much a question of words. This is almost the same proposal that was offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] several days ago, at least in effect. It is true that these women are not to be actually put into the Army, but they are to be in an Army auxiliary. They will be under the complete command of the Army, and I for one do not want to see this very unusual step taken, at least now, because I do not think it is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. DANAHER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Burton	Gerry
Andrews	Butler	Gillette
Austin	Byrd	Glass
Ball	Capper	Green
Bankhead	Caraway	Guffey
Barkley	Chandler	Gurney
Bilbo	Chavez	Hatch
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Brooks	DanaHER	Herring
Brown	Downey	Hill
Bulow	Doxey	Holman
Bunker	George	Hughes

Johnson, Calif.	Murray	Smith
Johnson, Colo.	Norris	Spencer
La Follette	Nye	Stewart
Langer	O'Daniel	Taft
Lee	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	Overton	Tunnell
McFarland	Radcliffe	Tydings
McKellar	Reed	Vandenberg
McNary	Reynolds	Van Nuys
Maloney	Rosier	Wagner
Maybank	Russell	Wheeler
Millikin	Schwartz	White
Murdoch	Smathers	Wills

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], I desire to make a few observations. I have listened with intense interest to what my distinguished colleague from Connecticut has said with reference to his amendment, because I know he is thoroughly interested in the successful prosecution of the war. I believe fully in his patriotism and his integrity and in his desire to cooperate to the very fullest extent in the successful conclusion of the war, particularly insofar as the United States of America is concerned.

Prefacing my remarks with that statement, I wish to comment briefly on what he said with respect to his amendment which, if agreed to, would confine within the limits of the United States the services of the women who may volunteer. If the Senator's amendment should be agreed to, I am of the opinion that it would largely destroy the measure itself. It would have the effect of nullifying the intention of those in charge of the Army insofar as the services of the women in question are concerned.

I do not believe I could any better combat the arguments which have been so ably put forth by the Senator from Connecticut than to read testimony submitted to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by a very eminent and prominent woman from the State of Georgia, who herself served with the overseas unit of women during the first World War, from the time of our participation in the war to the armistice in November 1918.

In opposition to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the name of Mrs. Helen Douglas Mankin, who in her opening statement before the Senate Military Affairs Committee said:

My name is Mrs. Helen Douglas Mankin, from Atlanta, Ga. I am a lawyer in Atlanta, and I have served overseas, in World War No. 1, and I am at present, and have been for a number of years, a member of the Georgia Legislature.

Skipping over statements she made which are not directly pertinent to the subject of the Senator's amendment, I read further from Mrs. Mankin's statement:

Following World War No. 1, there was organized in this country a small organization known as the Women's Overseas Service League. It is an organization of those women who served overseas in World War No. 1, and I have had the honor of serving that organiza-

tion as its national president. I am now one of its vice presidents, and I have served in the capacities of both national president and vice president.

We endeavored to get through Congress a bill that would take care of certain women who served overseas with the American forces as civilian employees, but were not successful in getting that bill passed, although in 1925 an act was passed by Congress that took care of, or gave hospitalization to, certain technicians who were attached to the American hospitals overseas.

Now, there were only a small number of those women civilian employees at that time. The best figures that we were ever able to get showed that there were about 1,194, and you gentlemen know that it is hard to get legislation through the Congress that is going to affect such a small group.

Following the war a number of these women needed hospitalization, care, and attention, but as they had served as civilian employees it was impossible to get it for them.

Mr. President, I bring this portion of her testimony to the attention of Members of the Senate for the reason that it is concrete evidence within itself that the Army of the United States needs the services of women overseas as well as it needs the services of women within the continental confines of our own country.

I do not have at hand at the moment a statement showing the number of women who served overseas during World War No. 1, but I know that a goodly number of women served overseas; officers of the United States Army and Navy recognized the fine, the noble, the courageous work those women performed and the bravery with which they performed it, and today the Government recognizes that their services were almost indispensable. As the result of experience in World War No. 1, the leaders of our Army and Navy now find that the services of women will be necessary overseas.

Mr. President, I further believe that the services of women will be necessary overseas because they can there fill positions which are now filled by men. Likewise, women can fill positions which are now filled by men in this country. Even today, when we have in the armed forces of the United States, speaking exclusively of the Army, only about 1,800,000 men, there is actually a dearth, a shortage of labor in this country. One may call up any number of service organizations in the city of Washington only to find that, because there is not available sufficient labor, those organizations serving the public are unable to do work which it might be desirable to have performed.

Yesterday I had occasion to communicate with one of the service organizations in Washington for the purpose of ascertaining if it were possible for it to do a certain job. I was told that it was not possible, for the reason that the organization had but 9 employees, and needed 30. So it was with 7 other organizations which I called on the telephone. In each instance I talked with the manager of the organization.

At present we are experiencing a lack of labor. We know that there is a labor shortage in the stores, in the factories,

and in the fields. We know that in many instances the shortages will naturally have to be filled by women serving in this country, as provided by the Senator's amendment. At the same time, we know that there will be a great shortage of manpower; and so far as possible we want to fill that shortage. We want to supply the lack of manpower by the women of the country, who are today demanding that they be placed in a position to serve their country patriotically and voluntarily.

Mr. President, the pending bill would not make it mandatory on the part of any woman to enter the armed forces of the United States. The bill would merely provide an opportunity for the women of America between the ages of 21 and 45 who desire to serve their Nation and the United Nations of the world, not only upon American soil, but upon the soil of all the nations of the world, if necessary, in order to bring about the earliest complete victory for the United Nations and the United States. Women would not have to volunteer. The bill would merely provide them with an opportunity to volunteer their services to the Government if they so desire. They would know that if they should volunteer, the Army of the United States would be privileged, under the terms of the bill, to send them to any part of the world where the Army might feel it was necessary to have their services in order properly and successfully to prosecute the war.

As Mrs. Mankin said, during the World War there were various units of women in Europe on the fighting front, doing their part, and sharing the hardships of the men who were shouldering arms. The Army knows that the services of women will be necessary on the fighting front. Why not include them in a unit under the direction of the Army, coordinated with the Army, in order that they may do their part, and in order that we may not have a few little volunteer units scattered here and there over the face of the earth, and not directly under the head of any particular branch of the Government?

Mrs. Mankin said:

The Women's Overseas Service League, our little organization, took care of those women. Now, they had gone overseas, had been sent overseas by the United States Government; they were paid by the Government; they were subject to hazards of crossing; they were subject to the hazards of the bombardment of the Big Bertha, and things of that sort. Of course, they were not at the front. I myself was not with them. I served with the French Army. But those women, it always seemed to me, should have been taken care of by the Government, when they needed help following the war. Men who served right along with them and had not even been subject to the hazards of the crossing were permitted hospitalization.

She further said:

There was also another thing that I thought should not happen in this war that happened in the first war, and that is this: In the last war there were many small organizations, civilian organizations, some working with the American forces and some attached to other, foreign, armies; I served with one

of them. Some of them, I just might say, were groups of women who wanted to do something and, really, I do not think had the proper protection in the way they should have had.

Mrs. Mankin unqualifiedly favors the passage of the bill. She continued:

I really approve of all these small organizations of women that went overseas, but I thought at that time it would be much better if those women who felt that they wanted to volunteer their services could do it with their forces and be, you might say, under the protection of the American flag.

I came in contact with the British, with the W. A. A. C.—"Waacs," as they called them, the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and with other British women organizations, and I thought that the "Waacs" organization was a good organization.

I presume she was referring to the coordination of the women who were with the British Army at that time.

I thought that if we had another war and could have a similar organization, we would not have so many groups, isolated groups of women doing work such as I did when I was overseas in World War No. 1, when I did a man's work and carried the end of a stretcher, and I worked hard. I really felt, however, that it would have been better if I could have been with the American forces and perhaps working out my enthusiasm in a different way.

I believe that if we have a Women's Army Corps, and I hate the word "auxiliary," and I am speaking for the women of America in that. When I say that the women are tired of being auxiliaries, I am speaking for them. If they do the work, why not call them a corps; why stick that word "auxiliary" in there? Women do not like it; it is objectionable, and I am speaking now in a sort of aside and between commas when I say the women object to it as a whole, and I know women pretty well; I work well with them and come in contact with them.

I know numbers of them throughout the country, but the women members in the organizations have certain ideas, and I know what women like.

Several inquiries were directed to Mrs. Mankin in regard to various features of the bill which was before the committee for discussion. She further said:

Now, some of you gentlemen, of course, are not old enough to remember what happened following World War No. 1. [Laughter.]

Senator CHANDLER. Mrs. Mankin, I can well understand why you were elected.

There was a little byplay between Mrs. Mankin and the Senator from Kentucky, which the committee appreciated very much, and which added to the spirit of the occasion.

A number of inquiries were directed to Mrs. Mankin in regard to the Women's Auxiliary Corps, and she concluded her testimony by very enthusiastically endorsing the bill which we had before us for consideration, the identical bill which had been passed upon by the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and later passed by the House. As Senators know, the bill which is now before the Senate was considered by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate once. Later a substitute was offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]; and then we returned to the original bill as passed by the House.

Much as I dislike to disagree with my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], I think it would be a calamity to the country to limit the activities of the active, patriotic women of America to service upon American soil, particularly in view of the fact that we know that during World War No. 1 thousands of American women served overseas in aid of the American forces and the Allies. We know that today many thousands of women are anxious to do their part enthusiastically. We know that they will do it courageously. They are anxious to serve upon foreign soil when necessary in the interest of our Government and our Allies, regardless of whether the Army should send them to Singapore, Australia, or any of the 32 points in this hemisphere where today we have outposts and expeditionary forces.

Are we to deny the patriotic, courageous women of America the opportunity of participating in this war? It is as much their war as ours. It is more their war than the war of the men, because they, the future mothers of the country, will be called upon to exert their influence for right after might has been exerted in this world-wide conflict.

I ask every Member of this body to permit the women of America to do that which they are desirous of doing. They desire an opportunity to volunteer for whatever work the Army wishes them to do. They are desirous of aiding the efforts of the United States and its Allies, the United Nations, in bringing this war to an early and completely victorious end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. It is my understanding that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore am at liberty to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. He is out of the city in attendance upon sessions of the so-called Truman committee.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Is-

land [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained in various Government departments.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNOLLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present. I vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—26

Andrews	Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Danaher	Smathers
Brooks	Herring	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Nye	

NAYS—37

Alken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Rosier
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Burton	Lee	Schwartz
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McNary	Wheeler
Doxey	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	Willis
Green	Murdock	
Guffey	Murray	

NOT VOTING—33

Bailey	Gillette	Reed
Barbour	Glass	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hatch	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Lodge	Tobey
Bridges	Lucas	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Davis	Norris	Wallgren
Ellender	Overtone	Walsh
Gerry	Pepper	Wiley

So Mr. MALONEY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MALONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the negative). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote with reference to my general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNOLLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained in various Government departments. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present. I vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reynolds
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Barkley	Hayden	Schwartz
Brooks	Hill	Smathers
Bunker	Holman	Taft
Burton	Lee	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Wheeler
Chandler	McNary	White
Downey	Maybank	Willis
Doxey	Millikin	

NAYS—27

Bankhead	George	Murdock
Bilbo	Hatch	Nye
Brown	Herring	O'Mahoney
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	La Follette	Spencer
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	Maloney	Tydings

NOT VOTING—31

Bailey	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Lodge	Tobey
Brewster	Lucas	Truman
Bridges	Mead	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Murray	Wagner
Connally	Norris	Wallgren
Davis	Pepper	Walsh
Ellender	Reed	Wiley
Gerry	Shipstead	
Glass	Smith	

So the bill (H. R. 6293) was passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT, FOR SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to file reports; that the Vice President be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature; and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to inquire when it is intended to take up the agricultural appropriation bill? The bill contains some items in which the Senator from Virginia is interested, and he should like to have an understanding to the effect that they will not be taken up on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; it is proposed to adjourn until Thursday; and we hope that the agricultural appropriation bill may be considered on that day.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have an expression from the Senator from Georgia as to the suggestion made by me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think it will be possible to conclude the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill this week unless there

shall be a session of the Senate on Saturday. I hope that the committee will be able to get the bill to the floor of the Senate by Thursday, and, if the items to which the Senator from Virginia refers are not concluded on Thursday, I shall have no objection to their going over until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. We can adjust that on Thursday if the bill shall then be before the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing two nominations), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nomination of Glennie Flatrothers Whites, to be postmaster at Iroquois, S. Dak., in place of G. F. Whites.

REPORT AND CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF ANTHONY J. DREXEL BIDDLE, JR.

Mr. GEORGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the nomination of the present Minister, Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary near the Government of Norway and also his nomination to be Ambassador and Plenipotentiary near the Government of the Netherlands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reports will be received.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the two nominations just reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Norway:

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Norway.

To be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of the Netherlands:

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of the Netherlands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James P. Pope, of Idaho, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 14, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of the Netherlands, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of the Netherlands now established in London.

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Norway, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Norway now established in London.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry Grady Vien, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Arthur Roe, deceased.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

John W. Scott, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1947 (reappointment).

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY MARINE CORPS

Major General (temporary) Philip H. Torrey to be a major general in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

Brigadier General (temporary) Harry Schmidt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

The following-named colonels (temporary) to be colonels in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Donald Curtis	Oliver P. Smith
William M. Marshall	Henry D. Linscott
Clyde H. Metcalf	Evans O. Ames
Walter T. H. Galliford	Maurice C. Gregory
Ery M. Spencer	Andrew E. Creesy
William N. Best	Merritt B. Curtis
William A. Worton	Charles N. Muldrow
John W. Thomason, Jr.	Joseph T. Smith

The following-named lieutenant colonels (temporary) to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Max D. Smith	Clarence R. Wallace
David A. Stafford	Ronald A. Bcone
Richard H. Schubert	William B. Onley
John K. Martenstein	James H. Strother
John Kaluf	Ivan "W" Miller
Albert W. Paul	Joe N. Smith
Melvin E. Fuller	Louis E. Marie, Jr.
Frederick C. Biebusch	James S. Monahan
Frank P. Snow	John A. Bemis
Walter W. Wensinger	John C. McQueen
Lawson H. M. Sanderson	Howard N. Kenyon
Jacob F. Plachta	James M. Smith
Harold E. Rosecrans	Ernest E. Linsert
Leo Sullivan	Orin H. Wheeler
Hayne D. Boyden	William O. Brice
Franklin G. Cowie	Francis M. Wulbern
Christian F. Schilt	Edwin A. Pollock
Walter A. Wachter	Randolph M. Pate
William E. Maxwell	Lucian C. Whitaker

The following-named majors (temporary) to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Harold R. Lee	Otho C. Ledbetter
George O. Van Orden	Deane C. Roberts
Walker A. Reaves	Joseph H. Berry
Louis C. Plain	Zebulon C. Hopkins
Robert L. Peterson	Wilfred J. Huffman
Kenneth H. Weir	Orin K. Pressley
Arthur F. Binney	Robert H. Williams
Perry O. Parmelee	Randall M. Victory
Max W. Schaeffer	Carson A. Roberts
Thomas G. Ennis	John B. Hill
Ernest E. Pollock	Chester R. Allen
Wilcox T. Dodge	William F. Parks
Boeker C. Batterton	John S. Holmberg
Edward T. Peters	Clarence J. O'Donnell
Ralph D. McAfee	Paul D. Sherman
William M. O'Brien	John F. Stamm
Clinton E. Fox	James P. Berkeley
Frank C. Croft	William P. Battell
Saville T. Clark	Cornelius P. Van Ness
Hewin O. Hammond	Archibald "D" Abel
Joseph J. Tavern	George H. Cloud
Joe A. Smoak	Charles E. Shepard, Jr.
William I. Phipps	Thomas B. Hughes
William F. Coleman	Paul Moret
Homer C. Murray	Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
Edward C. Dyer	William B. Steiner
Melvin G. Brown	Frank M. Reinecke
Marly L. Curry	John M. Davis
Raymond F. Crist, Jr.	Walfried H. Fromhold
Richard P. Ross, Jr.	

The following-named captains to be captains in the Marine Corps to correct the dates from which they take rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

James C. Murray, Jr., from the 1st day of March 1941.
Wade H. Britt, Jr., from the 1st day of May 1941.
Thomas G. Roe, from the 1st day of July 1941

Oscar K. LaRoque, Jr., from the 1st day of September 1941.

The following-named captains (temporary) to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Levi W. Smith, Jr.	John P. Stafford
Lee C. Merrell, Jr.	Frank Shine
Howard G. Kirgis	Arthur H. Weinberger
Arthur E. Stacy	Stephen V. Sabol
Lewis W. Walt	Roy Robinson
Robert W. Clark	John E. Morris
Edward W. DuRant, Jr.	Erma A. Wright
Pelham B. Withers	Horatio C. Woodhouse, Jr.
Harry A. Waldorf	
Jack L. Stonebanks	John E. Willey
John B. Heles	Carl A. Youngdale
Hollis U. Mustain	Robert J. Johnson
Joseph O. Butcher	Robert M. Dean, Jr.
John J. Wermuth, Jr.	Douglas E. Reeve
John F. Dobbin	Philip C. Metzger
Robert H. Richard	James E. Mills
Gordon H. Knott	Charles S. Nichols, Jr.
Lindley M. Ryan	William J. Piper, Jr.

William R. Campbell Gavin C. Humphrey
Robert Chambers, Jr. Stewart B. O'Neill, Jr.
John H. Gill George D. Rich

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of February 1942:

James A. Donovan, Jr., a citizen of Illinois.
Earl W. Gardner, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Richard Dickson, a citizen of Virginia.
Louis E. Hudgins, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.
James L. Fawley, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of March 1942.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate May 12, 1942:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Carl W. Feickert, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

POSTMASTER

William R. Blackwood to be postmaster at Harbors Creek in the State of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of the Netherlands, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of the Netherlands now established in London.

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Norway, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Norway now established in London.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

James P. Pope, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lead on O King eternal and make plain the path of duty that we may understand that life needs the discipline of work to make it great and good. It is the pain of the heart and the scar on the face of suffering, the loneliness in the soul and the cross in the life, which gave lasting glory to the character of our Saviour. Oh, give us the faith that shall bear unmoved the cares of toil and shall murmur not when the chastening rod is heavy.

O Lord God be with the restless and the aimless throngs of humankind and let Thy mercy and wisdom break forth on their pathways, knowing that the dusk

always has its dawn and the twilight of pain leads to the daybreak of reward. Oh, grant that the days of darkness may be short and that those influences may be hastened which breathe forth from the bosom of God, by which men shall live and grow to the full stature of perfect manliness and by which all nations shall stand together in righteousness and good will. In the name of our Elder Brother—the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6802. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. BROOKS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of War.
3. Civil Service Commission.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. War Production Board.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be permitted to extend at this point in the RECORD a letter received from Gerardo Balbuena, Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

LIMA, PERU, April 23, 1942.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

On the happy occasion of the trip to the United States of North America, which is being made at the special invitation of the Secretary of State by Senor Don Jose Angel Escalante, member of the Parliament of Peru, former Minister of State, and eminent journalist, now deputy for the Province of Espinar and chairman of the principal war committee, the Chamber of Deputies of Peru sends its fraternal greetings to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the Union, and its most ardent hopes that at a very early period there may be definitely established in the world the principles of peace and harmony for which America is fighting.

I ask Your Excellency to please accept the expressions of cordiality of which Deputy Escalante is the bearer, especially insofar as they refer to our wishes for the permanent progress of our great sister nation.

With this motive, I have the pleasure of expressing to Your Excellency my deep consideration.

May God preserve Your Excellency.

GERARDO BALBUENA,
Speaker of the Chamber of
Deputies of Peru.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a national program for the physically handicapped, by Paul A. Strachan, of Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address which I delivered over the national network of the Mutual Broadcasting System over Station WOL, Washington, D. C., May 8, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on Polish Constitution Day and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

USE OF THE SPRINKLING SYSTEM

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Wilson addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

[Mr. Cox addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Boston Sunday Post of May 10, 1942, by John Griffin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, also, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Secretary Wickard and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

USE OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in the remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson], in connection with copper. I am glad to see the cooperation he has received.

I would like to direct the attention of the House and the country to how they are handling the building of temporary buildings in the District of Columbia.

If you will go down to the War Department temporary buildings you will find angle irons all up there, 12 feet high, and a 12-foot high galvanized fence on all of these purely temporary buildings. All of that space could be used for parking. No; they could not do that.

Another thing I want to refer to is the bronze outlets for fire plugs. Every single one of those buildings have those bronze outlets. If there ever was a critical item in our program today it is bronze. Why is it that governmental authorities go ahead on purely temporary buildings and use such strategic materials as bronze when the buildings are to be torn down and thrown away? There is no question but what cast iron could be used in connection with this work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement made by the Prime Minister of Norway before the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution from the Louisiana Bankers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, May 13, after the reading of the Journal and the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders that may have been entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McGREGOR was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article taken from this morning's Times-Herald, which was an editorial in the Chicago Tribune. It is called Charley the Smear. It refers to Charley Michelson, and it calls attention to the fact that Charley Michelson is trying to blame certain people for being unprepared, when the real fact of the mat-

ter is it was the New Deal, and we want the public to know that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Maj. John L. Griffith, of the Western Intercollegiate Conference, and some resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Senator MEAD, and also to extend my remarks and include another article on the Jewish Army.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 480, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, of the time at my disposal I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish], to be in turn yielded by him as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the pending rule proposes to make in order consideration of the pay adjustment bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. The members of the Military Affairs Committee who appeared before the Committee on Rules were asked if there was any known opposition to the bill. The answer was that none was known, which is as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may be better informed as to the details of the bill and to give better opportunity to members of the committee reporting the bill to be heard, and who should be heard, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is known as the interdepartmental pay bill. At this time I wish to discuss briefly the general nature and scope of the bill and to give some history as to the origin of the legislation and the course it has presently taken through the Congress.

The bill itself, Mr. Speaker, covers the pay in six of the essential services of the Government; it covers the pay of the personnel of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. It covers the pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men. In these four essential groups are covered most of the personnel affected by the bill. There is, it is true, the pay of the cadets in the two academies, West Point and Annapolis, which is covered by the bill but which remains as it has been for years.

The subjects covered in this bill are the base pay received by the personnel of these groups, the longevity pay—that is, the pay increase over a period of years—that the personnel may have earned due to length of service. It covers likewise allowances for rent and for subsistence, all of which I am going to cover in a little more detail subsequently. The bill covers the mileage that may be used by the personnel in these six essential services of the Government; it covers the retired pay; it covers the air pay and the parachute pay in all of the fighting branches of the service.

The history of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is this: About 8 months ago one of the committees of Congress passed a resolution calling upon the heads of six essential services of the Government, the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to organize a committee representing these six services and to make suggestions and recommendations as to changes in a pay bill which would more equalize and deal more equitably with the personnel of these branches of Government. After much study this interdepartmental pay committee, which, as I have stated, was composed of one representative from each of the six departments, wrote a suggested bill which was turned over to the Senate, introduced in the Senate, referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee and after consideration in the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate it was amended in some respects. It passed through the

Senate, came to the House, was referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs, and then re-referred to the subcommittee No. 8 of the House Military Affairs, of which subcommittee I am chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked repeatedly how much this bill is going to cost the United States, because cost is always an essential item of every bill. It is impossible to say with any degree of correctness and definiteness how much any bill covering the Army, the Navy, the Geodetic Survey, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps at the present time will cost. This depends, Mr. Speaker, on the size of these branches of the service. For instance, with an army of 7,000,000 men the bill will cost one figure; with an army of 9,000,000 men, as my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] suggested in this morning's newspaper, it will cost considerably more. I give you here today the figures which were given us as a probable estimated cost of the bill for an army the size it was at the time of the hearings when these figures were formulated. The figures are as follows: For enlisted men this bill carries with it an increase which will cost the Government \$220,000,000; for warrant officers, \$3,917,000; for female nurses, \$2,372,000; for officers, \$56,000,000. It can thus be readily seen, Mr. Speaker, that seven out of eight dollars of any increase in this bill will go to the enlisted men in these branches of the service; and they are the ones the committee felt really needed some help at the present time.

For instance, let us take grade 7, which is what we call the buck private, the first grade in the service of the Army and seaman in the Navy. We find that about a year ago we passed a law which said that a man being inducted into service shall receive the sum of \$21 a month, that sum to be paid him for a period of 4 consecutive months, and that thereafter he was to receive the sum of \$30 per month, that to continue until the end of the year, following which he would get an additional bonus of \$10. It always seemed to me unfair that a man who is inducted into the service should receive the sum of only \$21 per month merely because he was a new man in the service and merely because this Congress perhaps felt that over a period of several months he should be trained before becoming a real soldier.

This bill, as recommended by the Interdepartmental Committee, increases the pay to \$42 for the ordinary soldier and ordinary seaman. When he first goes into the service he will receive \$42 per month. This is a 100-percent increase in pay, but as it works out it does not carry with it a hundred percent increase all the way through, because, as I said, after 4 months that man would be entitled to an increase to \$30 per month under present law, and after 1 year's service he is entitled to an additional increase of \$10 per month, making, as you will see, after a year's service in the Army or Navy a pay of \$40 per month. This bill gives him \$42 per month right from the start.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does this bill have any provision with reference to the payment of any sum to dependents?

Mr. BROOKS. This does not cover that subject. That will be brought up, I am told, some time later.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman's committee is considering a bill of that character?

Mr. BROOKS. It spent this morning considering such a bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I hope the committee will soon report it.

Mr. BROOKS. Further along the lines of the stipulations in this bill, the general increases in pay cover the enlisted grades. When we began with a base pay of \$42 for the grade 7 soldier and seaman, we then carried that increase consecutively, but in decreasing amounts up to grade 1 of the enlisted service. Your pay schedule will therefore show the amount which the enlisted men in grades 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 receive, and, as I say, that sum carries with it a cost of \$220,000,000 to the Government.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. How about the Air Corps, is that included?

Mr. BROOKS. It is included in this bill too.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. The gentleman mentioned \$218,000,000. Does he mean \$218,000,000 a month?

Mr. BROOKS. \$282,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to cover another feature, the pay of officers. The Interdepartmental Pay Committee recommended a graduated increase more or less of all of the officers in the commissioned service. The Senate Military Affairs Committee made changes and recommended by amendment only an increase in the pay of second lieutenants in the Army and the corresponding grade in the Navy. It recommended no increase in any of the higher commissioned grades. The House committee did likewise, and presents to you a bill which carries no pay increase for the officers, with the exception of the second lieutenant in the Army and the ensign in the Navy. That means that a second lieutenant drawing a base pay of \$1,500 per year has been increased to \$1,800 per year, and a like increase is shown in the other branches of the service, so you have a \$300 increase in this grade.

In all fairness to the men who serve as lieutenants and ensigns and in the other branches of the service, we submit that the pay increase there of \$300 per year is still justified and amply substantiated.

There are a number of changes in the bill. There is, for instance, a slight pay increase for the female nurses which you will see on page 47 of the schedule and which gives them some little relief in their rate of pay.

There are two controversial items in the bill. That is, they were items which the committee felt were controversial. There is one reference there to section

14 (b) of the National Defense Act of 1922. You will see that that deals with what are called 24 (b) officers who have retired. I am not going into that matter now because it will form the subject of a separate debate later on and carry with it a full explanation, but I do want to mention that this was considered a controversial matter.

Then there is the Faddis amendment. The Faddis amendment, as you may know, deals with the commissioning of men from civilian life into the service. The committee felt that the Army, the Navy, and the other branches of the service should give careful consideration to the question of commissioning men from civilian life into the branches of the service and should proceed very cautiously in that respect. The committee first adopted the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] and subsequently changed to an amendment suggested by General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the Army. That amendment with one slight change remains in the bill that you are to consider today.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then are we to understand it is the intention of the Committee on Military Affairs to offer an amendment to strike the so-called Faddis amendment from the bill as reported to the House?

Mr. BROOKS. The Faddis amendment remains there, but it was changed from the original Faddis amendment to the one suggested by General Marshall.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If it is not contemplated striking out what is in the bill now referred to as the Faddis amendment, I am authorized by the Navy Department to offer an amendment somewhat similar and along the same line.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

There is another feature, Mr. Speaker, that ought to be mentioned, and that is the feature of suspending the bonus for reenlistment. That came in the Senate bill. The committee deliberated on that long and hard, and I may say here that our subcommittee met in executive session for over 3 weeks, almost a month, in the morning and in the afternoon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. The committee went over the bill word by word and line by line, to measure the importance of each and every part of the bill. Mr. Speaker, we found at one time in considering the merits of the bill that the question of whether we should strike out one stipulation was before us. I believe the committee were inclined to favor the striking out of this one stipulation of the bill, but it was found that to strike out this one little phrase would have affected some 138 acts which this Congress had passed over the years from time to time in piecemeal legislation. We did not feel that in an effort to preserve a balance among the various branches of the Government affected and in an effort to preserve a balance among the groups affected in

each branch of service we should go so far as to examine into the merits of 138 acts passed by this Congress, representing the will and the intent of the Congress at the time of passing such acts.

So the committee presents to you a bill which does contain changes. It contains changes which we feel do away with some of the inequities and some of the injustices which have been carried in our law. It is not a bill that will disrupt the Services; it is not a bill that will do anything but further build up the morale of the Army, the Navy, and the other branches of the Service. It is a bill which is very much needed and will go a long way toward giving the proper recognition to the man who carries the gun. It is a bill that will help us carry on this war and make it easier and quicker to bring victory to our banner.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Does the gentleman mean to say that you have eliminated all gratuities for reenlistment?

Mr. BROOKS. No; we just suspended them for the duration of the emergency.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman understands, of course, that we have a double gratuity in the Navy provided the man ships over within 24 hours.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. That has been suspended for the emergency. The committee discussed the matter at great length and felt that this is a time which calls for the patriotic service and patriotic acts of everyone, and that a man who has been serving in the armed forces of the Nation, whether it be in the Army or the Navy, should reenlist when his time of enlistment comes to a close. He does not need a bonus for that act. The Army inducts its men by the use of the selective service, and the committee felt that there is no necessity now for a bonus in order to induce a man to reenlist.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct, I may say, but you run into this problem. After the war is over we shall have a two-ocean fleet. It will be necessary to man those ships, and we must have a contract Navy to carry on the regular peacetime pursuits of the Navy. If we eliminate the regular gratuity in addition to this double gratuity we have been paying recently, I believe we will disrupt the naval service.

Mr. BROOKS. I fully agree with the gentleman as to the necessity of carrying it in the bill, but it is merely suspended during this time of emergency and will be carried right on through in the bill as it has been the law for a number of years, so there should be no trouble there.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I thoroughly agree with him that the act which gave \$200, \$400, and \$600 for enlistment within 24 hours should be suspended since we have gotten into the war. However, the gentleman cannot deny the force of the statement made

by the gentleman from California that we must have a contract Navy or else, when the emergency is over, we shall not have anybody under contract to stay in the Navy. For that reason, the present law with reference to gratuities for reenlistment should not be stricken out.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is correct. It is not stricken out, it is merely suspended. There is nothing in this bill that will prohibit the Navy from contract service in the future. Personally, I hope the Navy continues with the contract service. However, we do prohibit them in this legislation from paying a bonus for that purpose.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, since we are in the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with a unanimous report from both the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Rules.

It may be well to refer briefly to the past history of this legislation. If my memory serves me correctly, the authors of the draft proposal, who met in the Harvard Club at New York a few years ago to promote a draft bill, suggested a pay of \$5 a month for the soldiers and sailors. The House in its wisdom, under the Selective Training and Service Act, increased that amount to \$21 for the enlisted personnel for the first 4 months of service. After that they were to get \$30. That was the pay for enlisted men adopted in the Selective Training and Service Act 2 years ago. Today again the House in its wisdom, and in justice to the millions of service men, is about to increase their pay, I hope by a virtually unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate, to \$42 a month.

Of course, \$42 a month is not on a par with the pay received by the average wage earners in America, yet the Government will then be paying our soldiers more than any other country, with the possible exception of Canada and Australia. It is a simple act of justice and a very proper act by the Congress in the midst of war, and it should do a great deal to increase the morale not only of the soldiers but of their families back home, who see our wage earners receiving \$5, \$10, and sometimes as high as \$15 a day.

No one knows just how much money this bill will call for because no one is a mind reader and no one knows how long this war will last. All of us Members of Congress are asked daily what we think of how long the war may last.

I am, possibly because I am on the Foreign Affairs Committee or possibly because I am interested in the military, but I know no more than any other Member of Congress about it. I know nothing more than what I read in the newspapers. This war may last 6 months or 6 years. We may know in a few months' time, if the Russians are able to hold the German attack, whether the war will be a short or a long war.

At the end of this year we will have an army, according to official reports, of

3,600,000. It is my opinion, if the war lasts 2 years, and it may well last 2 years or more, by the end of 1943 we will have 2,000,000 more. And by the end of 1944, another 2,000,000. So I believe if the war lasts until the end of 1944, we will have an army of 7,600,000, an air force of 1,400,000, and a Navy of 1,000,000, making a total of 10,000,000 in our armed forces. This would mean that this increased pay bill would cost well over a billion dollars a year, probably a billion and a half dollars a year by the end of 1944.

This is a war measure for the successful conduct of the war and for the prosecution of the war to final victory.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Could the gentleman tell us what the cost of this bill will be for an army of 3,600,000 as contemplated for the present year?

Mr. FISH. I believe it is stated in the report on the bill to be about \$400,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is that the increase or the total?

Mr. FISH. That is the increase in the pay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time; I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I believe all Members of Congress are agreed that we are in an all-out war, all-out in sacrifice in service, and all-out in effort. We are all united and determined to continue the war without compromise or appeasement until final victory, no matter what it may cost in blood, money, and tears. We are about to vote for this bill providing for at least a billion dollars additional pay for our armed forces by 1943.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have just hurriedly examined this bill and as I read it, the lowest-paid enlisted man will receive \$42 a month.

Mr. FISH. That is correct; in the Army, Navy, and in the Coast Guard services.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think that is fairly good, and I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the original conscription bill was before the House, I offered an amendment providing for an increase of pay up to \$50 a month as base pay to all drafted men. I am going to offer the same amendment today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And at that time the House rejected it by a vote of about 39 to 89. I sincerely hope that today when this increase in the base pay of the drafted man comes up for a vote, it will be passed unanimously by the House. These boys are the ones who have to do the fighting and the dying.

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman has made that statement. I voted the first time when the bill went through the

House, for the Selective Service Act. When it came back after being amended in the Senate, I voted against it. There were a number of amendments that had been suggested and if they had been in the bill, including the one offered by the gentleman from Montana, I would have voted for it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With reference to the statement which the gentleman has just made, I think every Member of the House would have voted for the bill if it had contained reasonable pay for the men we were putting into the Army which, in my judgment, would have been around \$50 a month.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman, I am sure, is quite right and reflects the prevailing sentiment of the House and of the American people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in the short time which I have at my disposal I do not intend, of course, to undertake to discuss the details of this legislation, but I do want to commend the Committee on Military Affairs for giving us this opportunity to increase the base pay of those in the armed forces as contained in this proposal. Of course, we all agree, I think, that monetary consideration is not what motivates the young men who are giving their lives or offering their lives in defense of the liberties of our people, but there is justice in giving them more nearly adequate compensation than we have provided heretofore. The cost of everything we have in this country has gone up, and I think it is only right and just that we should provide a higher rate of compensation for the armed forces. Therefore, I shall take great pleasure not only in supporting the rule but in supporting the bill when it comes before the House, and I hope there will not be a single vote cast in this House against this legislation, which only undertakes to recognize the valiant services of those who are going into our armed forces.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, when the rule came up before the Committee on Rules, I asked that committee to make the time for general debate a little longer than 2 hours, upon the assumption that I would need a little extra time on one provision of the bill, section 15, the last paragraph. I am taking this time now to call attention to a change in my presentation of that subject matter when the rule was held down to 2 hours of general debate. I then determined upon placing in the RECORD yesterday detailed information regarding the last paragraph of section 15, which deals with those officers eliminated under section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act. If Members will turn to the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1696, they will find there and on the following pages, under my extension of remarks, and under those of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], information that will be quite wholesome reading for

them before they go into the consideration of the merits or demerits of section 15, in its last paragraph. I placed that in the RECORD in that form to protect the Congress against anything going through here as a sleeper; and if you want to vote for that provision, I ask you to look into it and see all that you are voting for and figure out in advance what is coming when that provision comes up for amendment under the rule on the bill. I placed the information in the RECORD yesterday for the protection of Congress, so that gentlemen will know what they are voting for. Read and judge for yourselves just what position you want to try to justify when you go back to your own constituencies.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES W. WADSWORTH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a very able and constructive address made yesterday by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] upon the occasion of his receiving an honorary degree of doctor of law from the Rochester University. I know that all of our colleagues are pleased to hear of this great honor conferred upon our distinguished friend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, by inserting a speech of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] and also to insert a letter which I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAY READJUSTMENT OF 1942

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2025, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is entitled to 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] to 1 hour.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to make a very brief general statement with respect to this legislation. It will consist more of some facts not particularly related to the detailed provisions and sections of the legislation, but to the history of it, and how it comes before this

body. Some months ago the United States Senate passed a resolution calling upon the War and Navy Departments to set up an interdepartmental committee for the study of the general subject of pay of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. That resolution related particularly to the grade known as enlisted men. As a result of that resolution there was set up in the War Department a committee composed of gentlemen who represented each of those services, known as the interdepartmental committee. That committee made a recommendation to the Congress of the United States. As a result of that study in the departments concerned, the Senate of the United States passed the bill S. 2025, which is now before us for consideration.

After that bill passed the Senate it was referred, in the usual course of procedure, to the House Military Affairs Committee. When the bill came before that committee we conducted rather extensive hearings. We heard everybody who wanted to be heard in support of the legislation. No one at all appeared in opposition to it, as I recall the record.

After the hearings had been completed the House Military Affairs Committee held executive sessions on the measure, and after general discussion of the terms of the bill it was decided to refer the measure to a special legislative subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee. That was done. That committee was headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks]. That committee was directed to make a careful and cautious study of every provision in the measure and to report the bill to the whole committee with their recommendations. I know that after the bill was referred to that special committee, they spent several days, many hours each day, not only studying carefully the provisions of the bill, but as they had a right to do, they conducted additional hearings which I understand were not reported or printed as a part of the hearings before the House. After they had done that the committee reassembled as a whole and received their report and acted thereon.

So that we bring to you today a pay bill relating to these five different services with the unanimous report and judgment of the House Military Affairs Committee, with a few exceptions.

One of the things which I reserved the right to oppose was the question of increase in retired pay of retired Army officers. There is one provision in the bill relating to that subject that I think ought to be stricken out. That is the latter part of section 15 of the bill, which contains a provision that would cover some 121 to 125 Regular Army officers who have been retired for one thing or another. In most instances they were retired because of undesirable or unsatisfactory service.

As I understand this bill, it makes rather drastic increases in the compensation of those retired officers. I object to that. I do not think the pay of retired officers of the last World War applies to this particular situation and this partic-

ular piece of legislation. This is a pay bill and the committee, after carefully studying the facts, decided that the present base pay, as well as the retired pay of all Army officers above the grade of second lieutenant, was probably reasonable at this time, but might ultimately require some additional study and legislation. We have agreed in the Military Affairs Committee that we will set up a special committee to make a study of the general subject of pay of the upper grades of the Army of the United States, including the Navy and other services.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think there should be a joint committee from the House and Senate to deal with this question? In 1922 when the pay bill was drafted there was a joint committee, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who was Senator at that time, was chairman of the joint committee. Does not the gentleman think it is better to have a joint committee than to have just one committee to deal with that matter?

Mr. MAY. I not only think it is desirable to have a joint committee, but I should greatly favor setting up a joint committee to make a study of the whole situation. I would be happy to suggest that those members be selected from the House Military Affairs Committee, the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the House Naval Affairs Committee, the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] be included as one of the members.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For that very reason, does not the gentleman think the wise course to pursue now would be to make this bill provide for only during the emergency or 6 months or a year after the emergency?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is anticipating an amendment which he proposes to offer and trying so to speak to milk the court for an expression of opinion in advance. The court, having had some experience in the matter of popping off with curbstone opinions and judgments, reserves that question until the matter has been debated.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is not this the first time the gentleman ever made that reservation?

Mr. MAY. Well, I have not had the matter put up to me.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I mean talking about curbstone opinions.

Mr. MAY. Oh, yes; and I know of several gentlemen in the House who are rather liberal with curbstone opinions. I hope the gentleman does not take that personal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to conclude my statement, because there are some other Members who have given this much more study than I have who want to debate it. However, I want to say that my purpose in the handling of this legislation from the very beginning has been to take care of the men in the lower groups. In other words, the selectees and the fighting forces who are in the

field, and the men who will be sent to the front to bleed and die, if anybody does.

I feel, so far as I am concerned, that Army officers who are retired are adequately and well taken care of under present legislation. I am willing, however, to give further study to this subject if and when the time comes that it should be, as has been indicated here.

I am wholeheartedly for this bill; I think it ought to pass.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. This morning I received a letter from a father who stated that he had three sons in the service. He wondered if this bill carried a provision for retention of a certain part of this salary increase for the use of the boys after they get out of service. Was this matter considered by the committee?

Mr. MAY. The committee considered a number of things along that line, including one to provide that a part of their pay should be invested in Government bonds to be handed over to them when they returned from the foreign service; but the committee could not find any ground or basis upon which to do such a thing as that, and it was not included in the legislation. I believe it would probably have been unwise to do it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it not a fact, I ask the distinguished chairman of this committee, this bill deals almost entirely with pay increases of the enlisted personnel? That outside of second lieutenants there is no pay increase in the bill for officers?

Mr. MAY. None whatever except allowances. Where under existing law certain allowances are 60 cents a day we raised that to 70.

Mr. BROOKS. The amendment to section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act, to which the gentleman refers, covers only 125 officers.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It also deals with the rental allowances.

Mr. MAY. It deals with allowances in general.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I believe every Member of the House knows the purpose of this bill and the situation which brought about its introduction.

As the chairman of the committee has just stated, generally speaking, the bill affects only those below the grade of second lieutenant. Any person who has ever had anything to do with an Army or Navy pay bill must realize that at best it presents a most difficult question. I suppose every Member of the House, like most of us on the committee, has been contacted by representatives of almost

every type of service man, past or present, with the thought that injustices exist in the present law. There are doubtless many injustices, but it has seemed to me that it would be a very unwise and an almost impossible task to attempt to remedy every injustice now existing in a pay bill in the midst of war-time.

In the consideration of the details of this bill the subcommittee has worked very diligently. This has been carried out almost entirely by members of a subcommittee on military affairs, a special subcommittee on pay under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks]. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who, more than anybody on our side has considered the important details of this bill. He, by the way, is a former Regular Army officer. I doubt if there is anyone in better position from personal experience to know the many ramifications presented by the provisions of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my experience in the Army does not fit me as an expert on Geodetic Survey or on Navy matters, and a lot of other things covered by this bill. This bill embraces a great many different services; so, when it comes to the point of asking questions, please spare me a little leeway on some of these other branches of the Federal service.

The best analysis I have seen of the bill, technical as it is, is that compiled by the committee which appears in the report starting at page 9 of House Report 2080. There you will find the answer to almost any question that may arise in your mind regarding the technical part of the bill.

Generally speaking, there has been a serious effort on the part of the committee to standardize the pay of the various services covered. In the first paragraph on page 9 you will find the pay for the various grades of enlisted rank set out in very simple and concise form. In the second paragraph you will find that the \$10 bonus for service per month beyond 1 year has been eliminated. You will find the various specialists' ratings set out there in paragraph 3 are now eliminated.

In paragraph 4 of the analysis you will find that we have attempted to standardize the longevity time for the National Guard and Reserve service. You will find that for the duration of the war the enlisted allowance for reenlistment is eliminated. That is for the duration of the emergency and 6 months thereafter.

One of the most complicated parts of the bill has to do with the grade of warrant officer. On top of page 10 you will find an analysis there of the effort of the committee to standardize the pay of warrant officer grades, including commissioned warrant officers. The proposed pay schedule in the last column on the page there shows an effort to standardize and simplify that system of pay.

At the bottom of page 10 you will find the pay of nurses set out in parallel columns, including present pay and proposed pay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As I interpret that section 13, the increase in the monthly base pay of nurses is as follows: Under 3 years, from \$70 to \$90.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Over 3 years from \$90 to \$105; over 5 years' service, from \$115 to \$120; over 9 years' service, from \$130 to \$135; and over 12 years' service, from \$130 to \$150.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is correct.

On page 11 you will find the matter of officers' pay set out. You will notice there the only base pay increase is that of second lieutenant, which is raised from \$1,500 to \$1,800.

The next paragraph sets out subsistence. You will find increases in subsistence allowance there set out with dependents and without dependents in comparison with the old schedule for subsistence.

The next paragraph, 4, on page 11, sets out the rental allowances. You will find there a careful study of comparative figures, and without going into detail they will reveal a very improved schedule of rental allowances when we departed from the old idea of so many rooms per officer, getting away from the rooms and getting down to dollars and cents, which is a more practical basis on which to determine the schedule of rental allowances.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In studying the bill I am somewhat disturbed. I notice the increase in rental allowances for officers without dependents is more than that for officers with dependents.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes; that is true in some instances.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Here is the situation. An ensign's allowance is increased from \$40 to \$60; a junior lieutenant from \$60 to \$75; a lieutenant from \$80 to \$90; a lieutenant commander from \$100 to \$105. Those are with dependents.

Officers without dependents: Ensign, from \$40 to \$45; lieutenant, junior grade, from \$40 to \$60. With dependents there is only a \$15 increase, while there is a \$20 increase without dependents. Lieutenant, from \$60 to \$75; lieutenant commander, from \$60 to \$90; and commander, from \$80 to \$105.

Why did the committee raise the rental allowances to officers without dependents not in the same proportion that they raised them with dependents?

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that this was recommended by the Interdepartmental Pay Committee. These are the figures they recommended to start with: The allowance for those without dependents started at \$45 per month; then we go up \$15 for each grade. For officers with dependents it started with \$60 for

rental allowance, then proceeded higher for each grade at the rate of \$15 per month, which is the same in the case of those with dependents and those without dependents. It is the same increase.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

The estimated cost of the changes in the bill in total are shown on page 11 for the strength of the Army as it stood on January 1 this year. This is \$285,000,000. We could not get an accurate estimate for various-sized armies, and I am unable to give you an accurate estimate of the cost for the larger-sized armies that we are now recruiting.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I know there are many factors involved in arriving at these figures, but I wonder if the gentleman can give us any estimate as to how the basic \$42 a month for a private compares with the average pay or income of men all over the country? No doubt the gentleman has made some such study. I remember in connection with the \$21 per month we were told that the other allowances, such as subsistence, clothing, and medical attention made the pay of the men amount to about \$85 a month. These additional allowances will no doubt raise that substantially. Can the gentleman give us any figures on that?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The present pay of a private with more than 12 months' service is \$40 a month, when you take into consideration the \$10 bonus. This bill sets it at \$42. This is still well below the pay of the civilian population, but when you take into consideration the allowances it brings it up to where we thought it was within striking distance, although not as high as many of us would like to make it.

In arriving at that figure, I may say that \$42 was recommended by the Joint Pay Committee of all the services affected and I think the members of that committee could probably qualify as better experts than I in the matter of comparison.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman stated he could not get an estimate of the cost of different sized armies. What is the gentleman's own personal best estimate on the basis of 1,000,000 men? If we can get it in units, then we can figure an army of four or eight million fairly accurately. What would be the annual pay under this bill per 1,000,000 men?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The Army as of January 1, of course, would be about 2,000,000 men. You have the figure stated for the Army as of January 1, \$285,000,000, but you cannot scale it upward in exact proportion, because the new men coming in to the enlarged Army will not have this matter of longevity increase in their pay. In other words, as the Army increases in size, the number of men with these various longevity increases will decrease in proportion. That is one reason we cannot make an accurate flat scale of comparison.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman would not want to hazard an estimate on that?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I would not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may state that the Bureau of Navigation, anticipating that question, has figured out what additional cost to the Navy would be caused by this bill. For 1943, based upon the Regular Navy, authorized to consist of 500,000 men, there would be an additional cost of \$202,874,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is a point I would like to clear up in my own mind. On page 34, in section 2, appears this language:

The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 percent.

Then at the top of page 43 it is stated that the lowest paid enlistee will receive \$42. I am not clear on just how that is worked out.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. He will draw 20 percent on his base pay plus longevity pay. Very few privates will have longevity pay. They do not start drawing that until they have 3 years of service.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does that 20 percent have anything to do with foreign service?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is for foreign service.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to make that clear. The base pay of \$42 a month is increased by 20 percent if the man has foreign service?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is clear, is it? Now, there is another point I want to clear up. Does this bill make any provision for the dependents of the soldiers?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. No; the question of dependency is coming up in another bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I should like to know about the foreign service. Is the increase in pay for such service effective when the bill becomes law?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. HOUSTON. It is not retroactive at all.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is already the law.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. On the matter of pay for officers above the grade of second lieutenant, there is no question but that there are some cases of hardship. We felt that it would require more time than we could give to this bill at this time to go into that matter. The emergency just now is to adjust the pay of enlisted men and second lieutenants. It will be the intent of the committee—I believe I am authorized to say this—to investigate further the matter of of-

ficers' pay with a view to revising the pay schedule of officers above the grade of second lieutenant at some later time, but we could not hold up a bill of such vital and immediate importance as this to undertake a complete survey of the field of officers' pay at this time.

I owe the House an apology for omitting the record of one officer in this summary that appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1696. I shall call him officer No. 98. Commissioned service, 11 years. Present pay, \$57.50. Proposed pay, \$172.50. He has been on the retired list 15 years. I shall not name him. The record of the Classification Board is this:

Below average in handling men, administrative and executive duties, tact, force, judgment, and leadership. Self-satisfied and opinionated. Temperamental.

That is the one I omitted by oversight in including in the RECORD today, where you could read them, all the cases of those who were classified under section 24 (b) by the boards.

These 125 officers who were eliminated under 24 (b) of the National Defense Act were eliminated by boards of officers in their respective areas of service. The officers of those boards by military law had to be senior to the officers in question or up for trial. The findings of those local boards were approved by a board of general officers here in Washington, in the War Department.

I feel that the one "sleeper" that is in this bill and that is positively dangerous to the Congress is the last paragraph of section 15. Read and study well the extension of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1696. I have set out there the record of the board that caused the retirement or removal from active duty, the present rate of retired pay, and the proposed rate of retired pay for those 125 officers.

I hope the Members of Congress will not come back after this becomes law, if it does become law, and say they were not informed on what they were voting on, because I am sure that someone is going to question the grounds on which you justify your vote to increase the pay of these officers eliminated under 24b from an average of \$123 to an average of \$228 per month.

Their disability is not a physical disability. Their disability is that they could not keep in step with the Army, they could not match the Army requirements. They were retired at an average age of 40, and, with their service experience, they should be of great value today to our Nation, but their service record is such that the War Department will not willingly place any of them back on Army duty today. That is the background of those officers, and it is in the RECORD.

The reason I went to great trouble to get that into the RECORD for your perusal today is that I could not complete that analysis in time to make it a minority report. I was not sure I would have it when this bill came out of committee. There is a lot of work in compiling these data for you. With the cooperation of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania,

[Mr. FADDIS], I was very glad to get it into the RECORD entirely so that no one could charge that I had hand-picked the cases cited.

I have placed in here 98 cases, and the others have no classification except that they were placed under section 24b without explanation. I have placed in the RECORD all the records I can find on those 125 officers. I have not spared them except that I have not named them.

Now, the interesting thing about the committee report is that there is nothing said about the last paragraph of section 15. There is nothing in the setting out of the law, as required under the Ramseyer rule, so that you can compare this with present law. We do not want anything to go through here from the Military Affairs Committee without the Congress being fully informed and I want you to judge for yourself. If you disagree with me and if you think these officers who cannot serve the Nation today because of their incompatibility in the service, should be so favored, then vote your own conscience and give them this increase and this retired pay up to the average of \$228 a month. That is your pleasure, if you so decide, and I am not going to try to tell you how to vote, but you cannot say afterward that the committee put anything over on you unexplained.

I had the cooperation of a number of members of the committee in getting this before you after we completed the analysis of it, because we felt it was important to give the information to you. If we had had the time to make a complete analysis before the committee brought it out, we would have asked permission to file a minority report and would have given it to you in that form.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I do not believe the gentleman stated for the RECORD the time when these men were retired. I believe the gentleman ought to state to the House how long these men, who retired under section 24 (b), have been retired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Their average time in retirement now is in the neighborhood of 13 years, and I set out in the extension of my remarks that their average service is 15.7 years and their average time in retirement is approximately 13 years at this time. Their average age at time of original commission is in the neighborhood of 25 years. In other words, they went on the retired list at 40, and not for physical disability. They went there because they could not fit into the Army machine. They could not keep in step in a military way, for various reasons, and those reasons are set out in detail, and in as much detail as the board gave in their record in the War Department. I purposely omitted the names of the officers and simply gave them numbers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I want to say before I yield to the chairman of the

subcommittee that I have sat in the subcommittee with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], who served as chairman of the subcommittee, and I have never seen a committee or a subcommittee work harder or more diligently, and I have never seen one more determined to be fair than was the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BROOKS. I was just going to ask the gentleman, in all fairness to the subcommittee, as well as to the full committee, to state that there was no effort to suppress debate or curtail consideration of this particular section.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Not at all.

Mr. BROOKS. Neither was there any effort made by anybody to hide any facts.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman gave me every opportunity to present the facts with respect to the situation and I, perhaps, should apologize to the gentleman for not being able to assemble the facts for consideration by the committee sooner, but it was a long and difficult job to get all the facts.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me ask the gentleman if this section 5, interpreting its provisions in connection with section 3 of the act of 1940, does not place these officers at a greater advantage on retirement than it does any other service dealt with in this bill, because they retire on 75 percent of their base pay, while those in the other services retire on 2½ percent of their pay, multiplied by the number of years of their service.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes; it certainly does. They are lifted up bodily to 75 percent of their pay and longevity as of the time of their retirement, and that is a more liberal allowance than you have allowed to any other retired officers when retired for anything except physical disability or 30 years or more of service.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is exactly right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Have any of these men in this group offered their services to their country?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes; indeed, they have.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And they have been rejected?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. They have been rejected, although I believe there is one on duty today. I have been so informed unofficially, but I cannot recall just who gave me that information. They are not desired for active Army duty today by the War Department.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They were not rejected on account of disability?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Not on account of physical disability.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But passed over as not qualified?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise for the purpose

of expressing my enthusiastic support of the pending measure to raise the base pay of members of our armed forces from \$21 per month to \$42 per month. I desire to commend the Committee on Military Affairs for reporting this meritorious bill to this House for consideration and passage. It is my sincere hope that there will not be a vote cast against this measure by any Member of this body.

The gentleman from Iowa, who preceded me, pointed out at least one weakness in the bill. I believe it is section 24 (b), which apparently discriminates against some officers in the Army, and especially second lieutenants. It is to be hoped that this will be corrected and adjusted before the final passage of the measure.

It is my understanding that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will offer amendments to correct this and other apparent weaknesses in the bill. I am sure that we all realize how difficult it is for a committee to deal with such a broad, comprehensive subject without doing an injustice to a few. The main purpose, however, of this measure, as I see it, is to bring relief to the low-paid enlisted men, many of whom have dependents at home who are in great need of relief.

As one who served for more than a year in France as a buck private during World War No. 1, I quite naturally understand, and deeply sympathize, with the problems of the enlisted personnel of all of our armed forces—the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Coast Guard.

During World War No. 1 my salary was \$30 in the United States and \$33 per month while in France. Of that amount, I allocated \$15 per month to my aged and dependent father and mother. Seven dollars and sixty-five cents per month was deducted from my salary for my Government insurance, which left the sum of \$7.35 of my pay, while in the homeland and \$10.35 after the Thirtieth Division, with which I served, arrived in France.

Of course, we all realize that the monetary consideration does not motivate our American youth to join our armed forces at this time, that our valiant men are offering their services, sacrificing their jobs, and foregoing many of the pleasures and privileges that the rest of us are now enjoying in order to preserve the American way of life and keep America a decent place in which to live. The least this Congress can do, nevertheless, for our brave men in the far-flung corners of the earth, fighting for us and our children, is to pay them a decent and respectable wage.

I am disappointed, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that this bill makes no provision for dependents of these men, many of whom are certain to actually suffer unless some provision is made in the near future by this Congress. It is my sincere hope that legislation will be forthcoming making adequate provision for actual dependents of the men now in uniform, who stand today as a mighty bulwark against all that Hitlerism and the Axis Powers would impose upon a free people. Let us stand by the Nation's defenders as they are so valiantly and courageously standing by us.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to spend a larger portion of my time on section 24, the provision about which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is so excited. I think if we will consider it calmly, it will be found not to be so exciting as he attempts to make it. This subcommittee was a hard-working committee. This is probably the most technical subject that you could approach on military matters. Of course, the pay system has grown up over a period of 100 years or more, and there are things in it that are hard to understand originally, but you will find somewhere in the course of the years some good reason for them, some basis of justice that has caused it and grown up. Personally, I favored going along with the recommendation of the interdepartmental committee and readjust the pay from the top to bottom, and until such time as you do so readjust it you will have inequality and situations that will not coincide with a uniform system. I was overruled in the subcommittee on that, and I make no point of it, because I think this legislation should go through with as near a unanimous report as possible, so that this relief may be given to these men.

In looking through it all, we have found such disparity as between the first and second lieutenants that we were able to break it off without doing injustice to any of the others or placing the second lieutenant too close to the officers next above him, so that we have here a bill that is thorough and just and equitable to all concerned.

I understand that there will be a proposal to make this temporary. I am not so violently opposed to that, but let me tell you this: The American people always think that the last war they have fought is the last war there will ever be. Just as soon as this war is over you will have the old attempt to economize on your Army and Navy, and, just as we have had the same bill since 1908, with a revision in 1922, you are going to have this pay bill of 1942 up perhaps to 1952 or 1962. So I say that now is the time to rearrange the entire subject as nearly as possible.

On this question of section 24 (b), which is rapidly becoming the point of feeling in this case, I shall address myself for a little while. There is nothing to become excited about in the provision now contained in the bill. If you will study the situation confronting the officers eliminated under section 24 (b) you will agree the provision in this bill is a matter of common justice and equity. When you condemn the proceeding under section 24 (b) you will not reflect on any member of the War Department. The strongest denunciation I have heard of section 24 (b) has come from the Chief of Staff himself. He came before our committee last year and condemned the provision of the National Defense Act known as 24 (b) on the ground that it is unworkable. We gave him a bill which created a system during the emergency under which he felt that he could operate, because section 24 (b) was not effective. That bill is now the law as Public Act No. 190, having been approved on July 29,

1941. Here is the situation: Back in about 1922, when the Army attempted to enforce the provisions of section 24 (b), these boards of which the gentleman from Iowa speaks went over the cases submitted to them. Approximately 300 officers were recommended for retirement under section 24 (b). Those who were guilty of misconduct, those whose drunkenness had rendered them inefficient and unqualified to discharge their duties, were not retired under 24 (b). They were eliminated from the Army, with no pension whatever. There was a specific finding by those boards in every case that the inefficiency of the officer was not due to his own misconduct.

When they finished and had 300 of these cases go into the executive departments, all 300 of them had had the same treatment of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] speaks. However, only 126 of them were then retired. What happened was that every man with political influence, every man who had any way of getting into the executive departments got his name taken off of that list. Every man who violated Army regulations in seeking political influence to aid his case remained in the Army. Remained until when? Until July 20, 1941, when General Marshall came before the Military Affairs Committee and requested new legislation which would be effective. As a result, Public, 190, was passed, but we put in a provision that every World War officer retired under the provisions of Public, No. 190, should get 75 percent of his pay, just exactly as is the provision now contained in the bill that is before you.

So what is the result? The men who used political influence, the men who ducked and dodged elimination for all of these years of active inefficient service, because they violated Army regulations and remained on the rolls, were retired at 75 percent of their pay. Under Public, No. 190, there was no requirement of a certification that the officer's inefficiency was not due to his own misconduct. If you will look at the extension of remarks placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] it looks like a bad set-up, I am willing to admit. But I call this to your attention: There were a number of officers retired under 24 (b) because they were not able to get along with their commanding officer. Of course, the commanding officer said which of the two was wrong and who was to be eliminated, and it was the junior officer who was eliminated and not the commanding officer.

Something is said on the question of intoxication. No man included in this bill which we are considering today was retired because of intoxication, because that was the result of his own misconduct. If he became inefficient because of the fact that he was addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors or drugs or any other weakness of character, he was not retired under 24 (b). He went out without compensation.

Now, there is a question of democratic procedure and the dignity of this House

involved in this issue. I call attention to the fact that on the 14th day of April the War Department came before the committee and recommended the elimination of this provision from the bill. It had been placed in the bill in the Senate. At that time they said it ought to go out because it did not belong here. Now, your experience is probably the same as mine. That is, that a provision does not belong in a bill when the Department does not want it in the bill. That was the reason brought up by the Department. The only representative of the War Department to come before the committee said, on page 21 of the hearings:

I grant you there is some merit to the proposition.

Other than that, the only thing he said was that it did not belong in this bill. If you will read another paragraph of the bill you will see that officers retired at 2½, 3½, and 4 percent are provided for. That is the reason. But here is where I say the dignity of this House is involved. This bill was sent to the committee for hearings so that we might get the evidence for you, evaluate it and discuss it. Before the committee the War Department simply said, "There is merit to the proposition, but it ought not to be in this bill." We were given no other opposition.

On yesterday three Members of the House put into the RECORD identical information. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] says he assembled it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sure the War Department collaborated on that a little, because no one else had the information from which to prepare it. I would like to know whether or not they have included in those eliminated because of this gross inefficiency the man whose last efficiency report I hold in my hand, in which he stood "excellent" in all subjects discussed.

I would like also to know whether or not they have this man, who wrote me from California as follows:

I myself served over 20 years in the Regular Army. I have had five tours of foreign service in it, including 2 years in France, where I commanded a combat battalion and was awarded the Legion of Honor. I am now retired with the rank of lieutenant colonel, but with less pay than that of a master sergeant retired after only 10 years of service.

I say to you that the War Department should have given us the opportunity to ask as to each one of these men, "Was he the one with the Legion of Honor? Was he the one who had the excellent and superior efficiency report?"

There is nothing to be feared in section 15 of this bill; it is only justice. Now, I want to urge you not to be controlled in your decision on this matter by the stiff disciplinarian, the rigid military man. Each and every man affected by this provision is a wartime officer. These are only officers who served in World War No. 1. All World War officers retired until Public, 190, were retired at 75 percent of their pay. This group of 126 at only 2½ percent of their pay mul-

tiplied by their years of service. This does only substantial and positive justice, and it should remain in the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas in order that I may ask him a question.

The gentleman favors the retention of these officers who were retired under section 50, known as the "Board bunch." I call the gentleman's attention to one other of them, No. 83:

Below the professional standard required of an officer; requires close supervision, irresponsible in financial matters. Length of service, 15 years. Present pay, \$78. Proposed pay, \$180.

That is more than a \$100 raise.

Mr. KILDAY. May I ask the gentleman whether he yielded to me or I to him?

Mr. MAY. I yielded to the gentleman to ask him a question and get his answer.

The gentleman says he voted for the bill last year to enable General Marshall to weed out the unworthy officers. Some 200 of them have been taken out under this provision. Does the gentleman propose to take these fellows that have been out 12 and 15 years and pay every one of them this increase?

Mr. KILDAY. I want to make it plain that every one of these officers who served in the World War and retired under Public, 190, is entitled to the 75-percent retirement pay. This is a group of 126 officers who served in the first World War. They should be given the benefits of section 15 of this bill. It will put them on an equality with other retired World War officers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But does it not give them a greater advantage than officers in other armed forces of the country?

Mr. KILDAY. Not at all.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It goes beyond the Navy in this proposal.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; because the gentleman from Georgia never saw fit to prepare an amendment which would have brought the Navy men under it, which he might have done. This is an amendment to take care of this small group of retired World War officers. It would be a simple matter for the gentleman to prepare an amendment to provide for any naval officers in the same category.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that possibly the most important provision of this bill is that which relates to dependency allowance. I have just returned from a few days spent in my district. One question that was asked me repeatedly was on this subject. The increasing tempo of the war and the expanding estimates of the number of men that will be called to service are causing men with families to wonder when they will be called to the colors. Most of the men are making plans to be ready if they should be called, but, very naturally, they and

their families are wondering what provisions will be made to take care of their families. I recognize that this particular bill makes subsistence and rental allowance only for officers and does not go to the problem of the enlisted man, except insofar as it increases his base pay. I call attention to the subject, however, because it is a problem that must be faced before we can justly call the married man to Army service. These pay increases will help, but they do not meet the problem. I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will soon make a report to the House on the subject.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, like every other Member of the House, I am in full accord with the provisions of S. 2025, a bill to readjust existing pay and allowance rates of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the men in our armed forces scattered throughout the world have their eyes focused on Congress, hoping that we will expedite the passage of this bill that they may enjoy its benefits at the earliest possible moment.

I want to commend the House Military Affairs Committee for the time and effort spent in perfecting this legislation, and, in doing so, call attention to a possible inadvertence in the lack of provision for longevity credit for those men who were commissioned the hard way—that is to say, who arose from the ranks.

At the proper time it is my intention to offer an amendment sponsored by the veteran organizations of the country in behalf of those men who reached a commissioned status from the ranks. My amendment will simply provide that all commissioned officers who rose from the ranks shall receive an increase of 5 percent of their base pay for each 3 years of service, not exceeding 30 years; and the term "service" shall include active Federal and Reserve component service, including the National Guard, rendered as an enlisted man or warrant officer in the armed forces of our country.

The amendment will provide further that no commissioned officer will be entitled to receive pay and allowances of the maximum limitations contained in this act.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of S. 2025 is to readjust existing pay and allowance rates of the uniform services so as to provide adequate compensation and at the same time to give equal treatment to both the commissioned and enlisted personnel.

Unless my amendment is adopted, the intent of S. 2025 will not be carried out to the fullest extent, for the simple reason you have a group of commissioned officers today in all branches who received no longevity credit for prior enlisted service and who under the present language of S. 2025 will receive no such credit unless the bill is so amended to recognize prior enlisted service as covered by my amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we had this provision under consideration in the committee, that it was given very close study, and when voted on in committee it was defeated by a margin of only 1 vote. It came that close to being in the bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In addition to these commissioned officers who arose from the ranks, we have commissioned National Guard officers who have been identified with the National Guard for years. Practically all their spare time has been spent in furthering the interest of the National Guard.

To show the inequity of existing laws, let us remember that Reserve officers called to active duty are given credit for longevity purposes of one-half of all period spent on inactive duty as Reserve officer. Yet on the other hand, the National Guard officer has been given no credit despite the fact that he has spent considerable time in not only attending drills and participating in summer training, but likewise has been called to become continuously occupied with administrative problems.

We must not forget to compare the enlisted service of officers today who arose from the ranks as contrasted with the credit given Reserve officers for their service in an inactive status.

Mr. Chairman, in a few words the amendment I will offer at the proper time will provide longevity credit for the enlisted men of our armed forces who by their loyalty and service have advanced to a commissioned rank, and in addition it will recognize the patriotic service rendered by commissioned National Guard officers.

Since the purpose of S. 2025 is to provide uniformity in pay allowances and since to effect such a purpose it is essential that my amendment be adopted, I sincerely hope that the amendment may receive favorable consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill in which I am happy to say I find myself in accord with most of the Members of the House. I am sure it is a fine feeling to the members of the committee here today that they are raising the pay of the enlisted men and also the pay of the lowest commissioned grades, the ensign and second lieutenant. There is no controversy whatever over that portion of the bill.

The only controversy I know of in regard to this bill is over that portion which raises the retired pay of a certain number of officers who were retired from the service because their presence there was undesirable. That is exactly why they were retired. They were inefficient. They were incompatible with the best interests of the service. They were not able, while they were in the service, to render a just return to the service in return for the money they were drawing. That is exactly why they were retired. They were retired for the good of the

service. All you have to do is to turn to that portion of the Record which deals with the subject to learn that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Some of these men were apparently in the service for 15 years. Some of them had served overseas and were in actual combat. Why did they not discover this inefficiency sooner?

Mr. FADDIS. If the gentleman will get the Record and read the insertions that were put in yesterday, he will discover that for himself, and it will answer his question. A great many of them were retired because of being habitual drunkards or at least very hard drinkers.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I would like to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; I want an answer.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The reason many of them were not retired sooner was because there was no provision in the law to retire them until 1920. When you check the dates of retirement, you will find many of these officers were retired after enactment of the original authorization in the Defense Act of 1920 which was the first authorization the Congress gave the Army to eliminate them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Does the gentleman disagree with the gentleman from Texas who just said that none of these men were retired on account of drunkenness?

Mr. FADDIS. All I can say is that the gentleman from Texas must not have read the information put in the Record yesterday. The information that was put in the Record about that matter was taken from the files of the War Department and it gives the case history of these men. If the gentleman will turn to page A1698 and there look at the list of these men, he can ascertain for himself why they were retired.

I will leave it to his own good judgment whether the taxpayers of this country should have been saddled with the expense of maintaining a lot of worthless men in the Army who could give no return to the taxpayers for the salaries they were drawing, who were contributing nothing to the Army except inefficiency, who were trouble makers, who failed to pay their debts, who were habitual drunkards, who were incompatible with the best interests of the service, or who were not judged to be of sufficient efficiency to take an independent command or anything else.

There is no reason why those men should have been retained in the service, and there is no reason in the world why at a time like this the taxpayers of this country should be burdened by increasing the retired pay of these men. They have been gone from the Army 12 or 13 years. If they are not settled in civilian life and able to make a living by this time, then they deserve to fade entirely

out of the picture. The Government of the United States owes them no particular favors. They have been paid in full for their former services.

I know it is very popular among members of the committee here to want to give everybody more money, especially if some of the beneficiaries happen to live in your districts. That is quite true. But just the same, we are the guardians of the money of the people. We are the ones who should keep an eye on the expenditures of the Government and see that the money of the taxpayers is not spent for unworthy purposes. There is no reason why these men should have any further claim upon the consideration of this Government as far as giving them any raises is concerned. They were retired, and they were retired under provisions they knew of at the time and under which they have lived since that time. There is no reason why their retired pay should be raised today.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman understand from the list placed in the RECORD that the average raise for all of these men is around \$100 a month?

Mr. FADDIS. I understand so.

A great deal has been said about the class B board. I have been rather well acquainted with the affairs of the Army for a good many years. One fault I have had to find with the class B board is that it did not work often enough. Another fault I have had to find with the matter is that the findings of the class B board have been too often interfered with by higher authority and set aside.

In relation to the workings of the class B board there came a time when it was almost impossible to make them work. It came to be that the officer who preferred the charges, who was trying to get the inefficient officer out of the service, was more on trial than the officer he was trying to get out of the service. It came to be that where an officer gave a low mark on an efficiency report he himself was put to such inconvenience and such trouble in defending his rating of that officer that he came to the conclusion it was a lot easier to give a rating of "satisfactory" and be done with all the trouble he would otherwise have been put to if he were conscientious in his actions.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Is not that the reason General Marshall came before the Committee on Military Affairs last fall and begged and pleaded with the committee to pass a law, which happily now is Public, 190, to enable the Department to get rid of dissipated, incompetent, inexperienced, and disqualified men? He said they had tried for years under the old law to get rid of inefficient men, but due to personal and political influence it was almost an impossibility.

Mr. FADDIS. That is exactly true. The Chief of Staff of the United States Army himself admitted that the class B board could not be made to operate sat-

isfactorily enough to rid the Army of its inefficient officers.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. It looks as if we are about to spend all the time talking about 125 men. I do not believe there ought to be an increase in any retirement pay. What other increases in retirement pay are in this bill?

Mr. FADDIS. There are increases in retirement pay in this bill in respect to some other officers who were retired at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$, 3, or 4 percent of the active duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which they were entitled to credit.

At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to cut out all provisions to raise the pay of any retired officer in connection with this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Outside of the section to which the gentleman has referred, there is in this bill no increase in the retired pay of any officers except a very minor increase in the retired pay of second lieutenants, which is reflected in the fact that the second lieutenant's salary is raised \$300 per year and, therefore, that raise is reflected in the percentage retirement. That is the only other raise.

Mr. FADDIS. At the proper place I intend to offer an amendment that will cut out any raise in retired pay to any officer.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I commend the gentleman on his position on that point. I think it is a very fundamental position. The retired list and what we do with it has no part in our present war effort which the active Army is fighting.

Mr. FADDIS. Absolutely not. The purpose for which this bill was designed was to raise the pay of the men in the service and the men who are going to render some return to the Nation for the raise they will receive.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. This does not raise the pay of those men very much, does it?

Mr. FADDIS. I am not acquainted with just how much it does raise the pay of those men, but it does raise the pay of these class B men an average of \$100.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. As a matter of fact, this retirement pay is a pension based on rank, is it not?

Mr. FADDIS. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is admitted by Mr. Fitzgerald, the leading proponent of the proposed Emergency Officers Retirement Act, which was passed in 1928, who admitted that this is

a retirement based on rank. Does it not seem to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that instead of increasing these pensions based on rank we might, to a greater extent, increase the pay of the men in the ranks of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps and avoid a bonus fight after the war is over?

Mr. FADDIS. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the way to avoid a bonus fight after the war is over is to give each man a good proportion of the raise which he is receiving under the terms of this bill in war bonds today and then he would have it when he comes home.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman means by that statement that he would increase his pay now and pay a part of it in war bonds?

Mr. FADDIS. That is right.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. And it is further true that in respect of this retirement pay these officers have not contributed one penny to the retirement fund?

Mr. FADDIS. That is true.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In connection with the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], the appropriation bill for the last fiscal year carried an appropriation of \$76,156,000 for retirement pay to which no such contribution was made.

Mr. FADDIS. That is right.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not that make it all the more important that we concentrate at this time on the matter of increasing the pay of the enlisted man and adjusting any injustices or inequalities in allowances and then follow that with the gentleman's amendment regarding the commissioning of civilians into the Army? Could not a lot of these other matters wait until there is a study made of the whole subject of retired pay? It seems to me that the important thing now, and the thing that this Congress feels it ought to do in all justice, is to raise the pay of the enlisted man and let a lot of this other stuff go by for a while. I will support the bill, and I think that, on the whole, the subcommittee has done a splendid job, but many of these other matters can wait until the emergency is over and we have more time for consideration and careful study.

Mr. FADDIS. That is quite true.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And is it not also a fact that the Senate bill and this committee amendment go further than that and deal with increasing the allowances and the retired pay and also deal with a number of complicated things that are necessarily involved in a pay

bill? Why should not this bill be made a temporary bill instead of permanent legislation?

Mr. FADDIS. I agree with the gentleman that it should be temporary and in reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] I want to say that this matter of raising the retired pay of the class B officers came in as a result of the activities of a lobby composed of those officers themselves.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have just had some surprising information come to me to the effect that there is a misunderstanding as to whether the rates of pay in the cases set out in the appendix for May 11 are for active duty. I would like to emphasize at this point that the rates of pay are for inactive, retired status.

Mr. FADDIS. And those men will not be ordered to active duty.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The War Department does not desire their presence in the Army in connection with our war effort.

Mr. FADDIS. And if they should at any time be ordered to active duty, it would be on the active duty pay of any other officer, plus the allowances.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. FADDIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to mention one other thing. On the last page of this bill, page 60, in line 3, I intend to offer an amendment to that paragraph which will require the War Department to begin to report as of May 1, 1942, regarding the civilians they are commissioning directly into the Army.

This whole paragraph caused a great deal of discussion in the committee, and aroused a great deal of interest throughout the United States. There were a great many men being commissioned from civilian life directly into the Army, and whether wrongly or rightly, the people throughout the United States had gained the impression that this authority to commission directly from civilian life was being abused. I believe the matter has now been brought to a head, and I do not believe there is much danger of any further abuses of this power, and we have provided now that the Secretary of War must report to the Congress every 60 days in detail regarding all commissions given direct to civilians. I want to start that 60 days on May 1 of this year, giving the names, legal residence, age, rank, and branch of the service, with the special qualification of each person commissioned from civilian life.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more. The gentleman of course is the original sponsor of section 20 of this bill which relates to the issuing of commissions to civilians without military experience. I think, in justice to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I should say that he has rendered the country a great service in presenting that section, and he will admit, as he admitted in the committee, that the Army will have to have considerable latitude in calling in experts and technicians from business and industry and civilian life to aid in the character of war that we have on hand.

Mr. FADDIS. There is no doubt about that fact, and they have ample power under the terms of section 20, as it now is, to accomplish their purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask if the committee in adopting that paragraph on page 60 of the bill gave any consideration to requesting the Secretary of the Navy to give to the Congress similar consideration?

Mr. FADDIS. I believe the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is going to take care of the provisions in respect to the Navy. The Committee on Military Affairs did not feel that it was competent to deal with those affairs of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And may I say that the Navy Department does not feel it necessary to make a report every 6 months or every 30 days, but as to the other portion of the Faddis amendment, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. FADDIS. But the Congress might believe it wise for the Secretary of the Navy to report every 60 days, as well as the Secretary of War.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to make an explanation. The statement which appears on page 24 of the public hearings was read by me by request and does not necessarily express my own opinion. It was satisfactorily answered by representatives from the War Department.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to go into the technicalities of this bill. It is an extremely complicated measure and I think we can with confidence leave the technical details to the able members of the Committee on Military Affairs who have devoted considerable time and study to this important legislation.

I should just like to express the hope that when we come to a final vote on this bill, providing for an increase in pay of the men and women in the military and naval service, there will not be one dissenting voice. Having served in the United States Navy during the last war, I know something of the sacrifices made by the men and women in the service, by their parents, their wives, and children. When we raise the base pay of a private in the Army or of an apprentice seaman in the Navy to \$42 a month, with adjusted increases for the higher grades, we are not compensating our soldiers, sailors, nurses, and marines for the risks they take and the sacrifices they make. No monetary consideration can be said to be adequate compensation.

Our boys are not fighting for \$42 a month. They are fighting for their country and for her cherished traditions of freedom. They are giving their lives that this generation and the next, their children and our children, may be safe and secure from the yoke of tyrants and that all may have peace and security. For such a cause no sacrifice can be too great. That is the spirit of American manhood and womanhood, and it is that spirit which will ultimately bring victory.

When I cast my vote for this bill, Mr. Chairman, I am merely saying, in a very small way, to the men in the service that I wish to do something to provide some measure of security for your families. It is little indeed that we do here.

There is more, Mr. Chairman, that we can do for our boys in the service, not necessarily by way of pay and patriotic speeches. We have duties to perform. It is for us to toil and sweat here at home, to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary, in order that these boys may have every ship, every tank, every gun, and every shell they need. It is for us to set aside petty differences and to unite, as freemen only can unite, in a concerted effort—each making his contribution in accordance with his talents and skill to the best of his ability, and more—for early and complete victory.

We must win. We will win. Freedom will never die. I take this occasion to salute the men and women in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Military Affairs Committee are to be commended for bringing in their unanimous report on the pending proposal to increase the pay for the members of our armed forces.

No amount of pay could ever be adequate compensation for the supreme contribution that they are making to the welfare and the safety of our own country. What they are doing cannot be measured in dollars and cents. But a just and considerate government could do no less than give wholehearted approval to the pending measure.

Deductions for insurance, deductions for laundry, payments sent home for dependents in many cases, and many other things, make the present pay scale wholly and totally inadequate.

The least that a grateful people can do is to give thundering and unanimous support to the pending bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I am happy to have an opportunity to vote for a measure that will increase the pay of the enlisted men of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. This debate has been very informative. I am taking this time for the purpose of urging the passage of this bill and asking some questions so that our minds may be perfectly clear on certain provisions of the bill. As I understand the bill as written, the base pay of all enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps is \$42 a month, which begins with December 7, 1941, if this bill is passed.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And that will be the seventh grade. Then there are six other grades, which include warrant and petty officers, and the base pay of the first grade will be \$138 per month. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And if any of these men are called into foreign service, their pay automatically increases 20 percent?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; 20 percent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman understands that there is only an increase in the first enlistment of \$2 per month after a man has served a year. In other words, under the law today he gets \$30 when he has served a year, and he gets \$10 a month extra, and this bill gives him \$42 a month.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand it that way. I am in favor of \$50 per month for grades 6 and 7 instead of \$42 and \$48.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is what the law is.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand that all the men in the Army today, the privates in the lowest grade, whether they have served 1 month or 2 months or 10 days, will start with \$42 a month.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. They all start at \$42 a month.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I voted to increase their pay \$10 when the draft bill was up.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But then the man who has already been in the service for a year, by this bill, only gets an increase of \$2 a month?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes. So that it puts the seventh grade of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps all on the same basis, \$42 a month?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct; all in the same position.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The fact is this bill benefits those who have served less than 4 months, to a considerable extent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It doubles their pay.

Mr. MOTT. It benefits those who have served less than a year to a considerable extent. However, as to those privates and lower grade noncommissioned officers who have served more than a year, it benefits them practically nothing.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Those who have had less than 4 months of service have been serving at \$21 a month. That is the law now. If we pass this bill, we immediately raise them to \$42. We increase their pay 100 percent.

Mr. MOTT. That is right. There is no doubt that this bill is better than what we had before, but the idea that this is greatly increasing the pay of the average enlisted man is a lot of bunk.

Mr. BROOKS. The point the gentleman has in mind is this: When you get to class 7, which is what they call the buck private of the ranks, under the present law he gets \$21 a month, but that same man occupying the same classification, doing the same work after 4 months, would get \$30 a month. We did not think it was fair to pay one man \$21 a month and the other \$30 a month for doing the same work.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This puts all of grade 7 on the \$42 basis.

Mr. BROOKS. They are all on the \$42 basis.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And in the Marine Corps and in the Navy as well?

Mr. BROOKS. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then when you get up to the highest class, the first-class warrant and petty officers in the enlisted men, in the Army, the Marine Corps, and the Navy, they start, with the passage of this act, at \$138 a month. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, that covers the sergeant major. If the gentleman understands what a sergeant major is in the Army, and the corresponding rank in the Navy, he gets \$138. There is a \$2 increase for that rating.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes. So that is cleared up. Now I am sure that some of you gentlemen know from your investigation that we have heard a lot of rumors and talk of what is being paid to enlisted men in other countries. What does Canada pay her enlisted man?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman, in looking at the hearings, will find a chart that covers all of the major nations of the earth. He will find that Australia pays more than the United States pays even under the proposed increase, but we will pay slightly above the Canadian pay.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Australia pays more than the United States?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And Canada at the present time is paying more than the United States, but with the passage of this bill we will pay slightly more than Canada? Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. I think it is just the reverse, but it is pretty close. I checked those charts and it looked to me that we will still be just a little below Canada.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So that it is your understanding that Australia pays more than the United States. How much more does Canada pay its enlisted men?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman can interpret the chart.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee. I am sure the gentleman has it at his fingertips just how much it is.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not have the exact difference at my fingertips.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much more does Canada pay her men?

Mr. BROOKS. I said we pay more than Canada.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much?

Mr. BROOKS. It is a small difference, but it is a difference.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. You mean we pay more than Canada, or does Canada pay more than we do?

Mr. BROOKS. We pay more than Canada.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much?

Mr. BROOKS. It is a small difference.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Since we are allowing 20 percent for overseas service, I am

wondering whether or not that will increase the pay of our buck private above the pay of a buck private of the Australian Army?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I favor \$50 a month for grades 6 and 7. Well, whatever you write into this bill you will not write too much.

Mr. BROOKS. I fully agree with the gentleman. I am in favor of the ordinary soldier getting as much as we can give him.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Absolutely. Now, I want to say that I am in favor of the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. I think it is a just and proper amendment and it should be adopted. It gives just recognition to those who work up from the ranks to commissions.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Where in the bill is the provision that states that the enlisted man shall continue to receive the \$10 increase after 12 months of service?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is written into the bill.

Mr. PACE. I do not find it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am sure the gentleman will find it in the bill. I forget the page number.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The proposed increase of pay for the seventh grade, or the so-called buck privates, provides rates that are far more desirable than the \$5 per month pay which was proposed in the original selective service bill. Does the gentleman recall that munificent sum with which it was intended to insult the young men when they were drafted into the service in peacetime?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; that was in the bill, the one which proposed to draft every male between the ages of 18 and 65 years of age. As I recall it provided \$5 a month. That was the first draft draw proposed in 1940.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have heard that thing said so many, many times. I thought the people had gotten tired of saying it and hearing it. That amount was suggested in that bill purely as a token. It was explained over and over again before the Committee on Military Affairs and on the floor of the House. Five dollars a month—perfect nonsense!

Mr. DWORSHAK. But it was printed in the original bill when it was introduced.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It was part of the proposed bill, I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman from Kentucky and I can hire a hall and debate it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I favor the base pay for enlisted men in grades 6 and 7 of \$50 per month instead of \$42 for No. 1 and \$43 as written in

this bill. Under the bill as written corporals and seamen of the first class will receive \$66 per month; sergeants and petty officers of the third class \$78, staff sergeants and petty officers of the second class \$96, first technical sergeants and petty officers first class \$114, master sergeants and chief petty officers \$138.

If we give the seventh grade \$50 per month, the pay of enlisted men will range from \$50 to \$138 per month. This bill also gives an increase to second lieutenants.

Australia pays her enlisted men similar to our seventh grade of enlisted men, \$62.10 a month. I have been informed that Canada pays her enlisted men in the lower grades for foreign service \$65 per month. Why should we deny our 6 and 7 grade of enlisted men less than \$50 per month to start with? Under this bill our enlisted men will receive 20 percent increase of their base pay for foreign service and our enlisted men will also receive 50 percent increase for service in the air with our aircraft forces, \$50 to \$100 extra for parachute service. This measure also gives increases to the nurses with our armed forces. The increases for our enlisted men are especially necessary and just. They must take out insurance, pay for cleaning, pressing, laundry, repairing of clothes and shoes, pay for soap, shaving outfits and other toilet articles and many other articles they must buy. They are also expected like other citizens are expected to buy bonds and stamps.

Hundreds of thousands of our young men will leave behind dependent wives, children, and parents.

In a few days, it is hoped that Congress will pass an allotment act whereby the Government will make allotments to dependents and it will be necessary for our enlisted men to match the Government's money to provide support for their dependents. I cannot see how they can get along with less than \$50 per month, and I trust that this bill will be amended so as to provide \$50 per month for base pay for those in the seventh grade.

Under this law those in the other five grades will receive substantial increases. This bill also provides for a 10-percent increase after 4 years of service. This will greatly benefit those who have been in the service for some considerable time and most of whom are in the higher grades. Only a few of those of the sixth and seventh grades will benefit by this 10 percent, and that is another good reason why those in the sixth and seventh grades should receive at least \$50 per month as base pay.

We must not forget those who leave their homes, their families, and friends and business opportunities and go out to fight for us and offer their lives for us and our country should receive generous treatment at the hands of this great Republic. Let us cut out profiteering and boondoggling and nonessential projects and expenditures so that we may accord just and fair treatment to our defenders and their dependents. It would please me if we could secure for them a greater increase. I feel sure that \$42 a month to

start with is too low and we should not make it less than \$50 per month.

In the last World War the base pay for enlisted men was \$30 per month on this side and \$33 in foreign service, and then the boys when they came home had to fight for more than 17 years to secure their adjusted compensation. The amount that we are paying our enlisted men and officers is only a drop in the bucket compared to what we are spending in this great war effort. We can and we must win this great war. Let us express our appreciation and gratitude to our defenders.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the same amendment about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] just addressed the House. I was not present when he made his speech, but I do agree that his amendment should be adopted. I too have prepared an amendment and I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I are agreed that it accomplishes the same purpose. My amendment provides that when an enlisted man is promoted to become an officer, that the time he served as an enlisted man should count in computing his longevity pay, just the same as his time served as a commissioned officer.

On February 16 of this year this House by unanimous consent passed the bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] giving that longevity pay credit for enlisted service to the Navy. It went through by unanimous consent. There was not a single objection. Why come along with this bill as of this date and rescind the action taken by this House in the Maas bill insofar as the Navy is concerned? I can see no reason why credit for service as an enlisted man should be taken away from a man when he is promoted to a commissioned status in the Army.

The amendment was before our committee and as I recall it was lost by one vote; so it was a very close opinion of the committee as to the justice of this proposition. I want the House to know that in conjunction with the gentleman from Pennsylvania I shall endeavor to correct what we believe is an injustice being done by withholding credit for longevity service of enlisted men. I hope the Members will support our amendment when the bill is read for amendment and the proper time comes to offer it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that men who were commissioned from the ranks prior to July of 1922 are receiving longevity credit for their enlisted and commissioned service?

Mr. EDMISTON. That is true.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Whereas the men in the same categories today do not?

Mr. EDMISTON. That is correct; and that comes about simply by the deadline of a date. That has taken the privilege away from them.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to state to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSON] who just relinquished the floor, that at the proper time I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the tables appearing on page 26 of the hearings setting forth the base pay of the enlisted men in the other great armies of the world.

Mr. EDMISTON. And I shall have some additional figures to include in the RECORD at the time the amendment is offered to show that it would be decidedly to the disadvantage of a master sergeant or a technical sergeant to accept a commission; that it would be more to his advantage to retain his status as a sergeant than to accept a second lieutenancy.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. SANDERS. I am very much interested in the gentleman's reference to adjusting what seems to be a discrimination against enlisted men. As I understand the situation today, the War Department is now commissioning out of civilian life certain people whose special training renders it desirable that they be given commissions.

Mr. EDMISTON. That is right, and then every 60 days report to the Congress whom they have commissioned out of civilian life.

Mr. SANDERS. It is also my understanding that this same liberty of action does not hold true with regard to enlisted men. For instance, if there is an enlisted man already in the United States Army whose special training and special qualifications are such that he might be a desirable commissioned officer, the War Department has not the liberty of action that it has with regard to the commissioning of civilians, because the enlisted man comes under the requirements of Army regulations and Army regulations require certain things that are not required of civilians.

Mr. EDMISTON. That is true. Your enlisted man who is in the Army must attend an officers' candidate school to secure his commission.

Mr. SANDERS. Exactly. With regard to special training, such as for the Judge Advocate's Department, and I speak of that because I am an attorney, what earthly good would it do for an enlisted man to go to an officers' training school to qualify for that particular department, and is not the same thing true of other specialist branches? In justice to the enlisted man, where there is special training, the War Department should be able to give a commission to an enlisted man just as readily as to a civilian.

Mr. EDMISTON. I agree with the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own re-

marks in the RECORD at this point and to include certain quotations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

INCREASED PAY FOR ARMED SERVICE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that we now have an opportunity to consider S. 2025 and to provide for increased pay for the service of our selectees and enlisted men, and to readjust the pay allowances for the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The base pay of privates in enlisted service of \$21 per month is wholly inadequate, as it is now provided in existing laws. Under the act now before us this base pay will be increased to \$42 a month. This should be increased. While it is true that these enlisted men after the service of a year under present requirements receive \$40 a month, it is also true that during this first year of service the enlisted men receive the lesser pay, and in many instances receive less pay than do their privates doing the same service.

The act of June 10, 1922, for the first time established a uniform pay system for service in these several branches of service. The 1922 act provided for a readjustment rather than for a pay increase. Since 1922 many changes have been made in the original pay readjustment act.

The present and the proposed monthly base pay of enlisted men is shown by the following table:

Monthly pay of nurses

Grade	Years' service	Present pay	Proposed pay
Nurse.....	Under 3.....	\$70.....	\$90
	Over 3.....	\$90.....	105
	Over 6.....	\$115.....	120
	Over 9.....	\$130.....	135
	Over 12.....		150
Chief nurse.....		Pay as nurse plus \$50.....	(1)
Assistant superintendent, director, assistant director.....		Pay as nurse plus \$125.....	(1)
Superintendent.....		Pay as nurse plus \$208.33.....	(1)

¹ No change.

Mr. Chairman, as shown by the committee's report, no accurate information was presented to the committee upon which to base the estimated cost of this bill to the Government for the personnel that will be included in our armed forces under the proposed plans now recommended. However, based upon the strength on January 1, 1942, the annual cost is estimated as approximately \$285,000,000. Regardless, however, of the cost, as a matter of justice it is clear to me, Mr. Chairman, these men and women who have been called from private life to active service in our armed forces to provide protection for our country in this great emergency are entitled to fair remuneration for this most worthy service, they are rendering. The minimum basic pay of \$42 a month provided by this bill is at least a minimum that should be provided. I hope it will be increased by amendment. In this connection it should be remembered, of course,

LXXXVIII—259

Grade	Present base pay ¹	Proposed base pay
1. Master sergeant; chief petty officer.....	\$126	\$138
1a. Acting chief petty officer, Navy and Coast Guard only.....	99	126
2. First or technical sergeant; petty officer, first class.....	84	114
3. Staff sergeant; petty officer, second class.....	72	96
4. Sergeant; petty officer, third class.....	60	78
5. Corporal; seaman, first class.....	54	66
6. Private, first class; seaman, second class.....	36	48
7. Private; apprentice seaman.....	30	42
Seventh grade men with less than 4 months' service.....	21	(2)

¹ Add \$10 per month to total pay after 12 months' service.

² Eliminate.

Warrant and chief warrant officers of the Army are now paid according to the following schedule:

Army mine-planter service

Grade and monthly base pay:

Master.....	\$185
First mate.....	148
Second mate.....	148
Chief engineer.....	175
Assistant engineer.....	148
Second assistant engineer.....	148

U. S. Army

Grade and monthly base pay:

Chief warrant officer.....	\$175
Warrant officer (junior grade).....	148

The effect of this bill, should it be enacted into law, will provide pay for members of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, as shown by the following table, which also shows the existing pay therefor:

I am in accord with the measure, but would like to see certain amendments adopted. Well do I remember that an effort to raise the base pay of the soldier to \$50 per month was made when the Selective Service Act was being passed. That amendment failed to carry. I understand from several gentlemen that a similar amendment will be offered today, and I wish to announce that I shall vote for it.

The offhand suggestion has been made that this measure to increase remuneration is chiefly for the officers, and while I approve of that part of it I do not want us to overlook the base pay of the man who has to carry the gun and face the fire of the enemy. Certainly I shall favor an improvement of this bill in respect to base pay.

In spite of all our efforts to fix prices and ration necessities, the pay heretofore voted for members of our armed forces is diminishing in purchasing power. It is only justice that we should recognize that fact and remedy it in this legislation. It is far better today to attempt to deal justly with our defenders than it is to attempt in after years to make good in part any deficiencies for our fighting men.

Of course, it is staggering to think of the enormous probable cost of this war when we consider the other millions of armed men which we plan to have, over and above our present force, and when we think of the increased pay which we are voting in this bill. On the other hand, we cannot compare either the pay or the sacrifices which the men in the armed forces are making with those of anyone who stays at home. I think we should legislate on the basis that nothing is too much to pay for the preservation of this country with all that it means to us and to the future, and along with that, nobody is doing so much to preserve this country for ourselves and our posterity as are the men in the fighting forces of our Nation. With this background let us enact this legislation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that I express the sentiment of the majority of the Members of the House when I commend the committee for having reported the Readjustment Pay Act which is presently under consideration.

Much has and will be said in connection with the basic purpose of the bill; namely, the general revision upward of the pay schedules of the enlisted men and the officers in our armed services. There can be little dispute with that objective. I should, however, like for a few minutes to refer to section 20 of the bill, and with respect to that section I want to commend the committee for having given additional and careful consideration to the necessity of broadening the limitations contained therein. This section has to do with the issuance of commissions. As originally drafted, the bill restricted unnecessarily the power of the authorities to commission civilians who had had no previous military training. Obviously, it would have been unwise to pursue that course, for the prosecution of a war such

that additional allowances to the enlisted men in the service will very materially increase the total compensation above the \$42 minimum.

At the proper time I will be happy to cast my vote for the passage of this bill for giving this belated recognition to our men and women in uniform who are giving such heroic service to our country in this time of trial confronting us.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], that we have no more requests for time on this side. I remind the gentlemen of the committee that the sooner we start reading the bill the sooner we will finish it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, thus far in this debate I have not had much to say on this bill. However, on the whole

as that in which we are now engaged requires that the Army and the Navy have the power to draw upon any type or source of civilian manpower where those civilians have specialized knowledge or training.

I have come recently to learn of the creation of the boards composed of civilians throughout the country whose duty it was to interview prospective candidates for commissions and refer those candidates who seemed qualified by training and experience to the regular authorities in the Army. The practice of engaging the services of such civilian boards has met with some criticism. Whether that criticism has been well founded or not, I do not know. But this I do know. In the boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens in the city of New York, there was created a civilian board to interview candidates for the administrative and other branches of the Army Air Corps, which board was composed of an outstanding group of public-spirited, patriotic, and unquestionably competent citizens.

The principal member of this board was former Judge Edward A. Richards, president of the East New York Savings Bank, a man who has been most successful in his own private life and public service and who continually is engaged in movements of public interest devoted to improving the community and the country.

The other members of the board were Supreme Court Justice James T. Hallinan, the late Cary D. Waters, former president of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; Louis C. Wills, distinguished attorney of Brooklyn, and Mr. Mackin, an industrialist of that area.

These men I know served in a thoroughly unselfish and conscientious manner and served well. Their duty was principally to evaluate the background, training, and experience of the applicants and this their own executive qualities fitted them to do. In many of the types of places to be filled, no previous military training is required and, therefore, neither the members of the civilian boards nor the applicants should be criticized because they were civilians. It is rather unfortunate that general criticism of a method or procedure should be indulged in because it does result in injustice in many cases, and I know that any such criticism concerning the civilian board which operated in Brooklyn and Queens would be, in fact, unfounded and unjust. These men are as deeply interested in helping their country win the war as any citizen, whether he be in military or civilian life. Their long background of dealing with the public and appraising human characteristics, as well as discharging places of importance, were utilized in the work in which they were engaged. Rather than be subjected to any criticism, whether directly or indirectly, they should rather be commended for the patriotic zeal with which they discharged their duties. I want expressly to commend them and to express the appreciation of their fellow citizens for the splendid work they did. I want, too, to commend the authorities who were instrumental in utilizing their services and

express the hope that the system will be continued.

We want to do everything we can to help today. The passage of this bill is a step in that direction.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall take pleasure in supporting this piece of legislation because I believe the pay and allowances of the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health should be adjusted.

I have asked for this time, however, to say a few words relative to the argument some of those who are unfriendly to labor are making respecting the pay of \$21 per month the selectees have been drawing under the Selective Training and Service Act.

Oh, some of these labor haters can roll \$21 per month around in their mouths until it has the ring of Judas' 30 pieces of betrayal silver. They try, by innuendo and suggestive if not by direct charge, to create the impression that labor is not only betraying their country but their boys in asking for a fair wage scale—in asking for their just portion of the profits of industry.

Well, let us look into this charge. I think I have a right to express my views on this subject, because I have a boy whose background for clean, manly living and scholastic attainment—and I say it with filial pride—is all that a father could ask, and he is drawing exactly that sum, \$21 per month. Labor, the very class some are now trying to harass by the passage of repressive legislation, has more boys drawing \$21 per month than any other class in America. And I testify with pride that I have not heard my boy, nor have I heard any of the sons of labor, complaining about the pay they are drawing. Why? Because, thank God, they are fighting for love of country and not for love of money. While you could not hire them to fight for \$21 per month, or any other sum, you could not hire them not to fight when the safety and security of this Republic is in jeopardy for all the gold of a Midas.

It is a cheap, common argument—one that is calculated to incite prejudice and dampen patriotism—and therefore one that is unworthy of the true patriot. And, too, it is an argument that comes with poor grace from many of those who are making it. As to this let me be specific in my reference. I refer to those who, through pull and influence, have been able to take their sons out of combat service—out of the \$21 class—by decorating them with epaulets and sheltering them, for the duration, in the War and Navy Departments at good salaries—at salaries that are far in excess of the best paid laborers in this country.

Let me remind you that labor has probably more at stake in this conflict than any other class. They know what has happened to labor in the countries that are under the ruthless heels of the dictators. Then, too, as I stated, labor has more sons in the combat service than any other class in America. Do you

think that labor does not treasure its American freedom? Do you think that liberty is not as dear to them as it is to you? Do you think that they want to lose their freedom and liberty and become the slaves and vassals of a Hitler? Do you think that labor will let their own sons—their own flesh and blood—down? Do you think that because their hands are callous from toil that their hearts are not warm with filial love? Pray, I beseech you, tell me what kind of people do you think our laboring people are? Oh, let me paraphrase a famous passage from the Merchant of Venice. Hath not a laborer eyes? Hath not a laborer hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as the industrialist, the banker, the farmer, Members of Congress, yes; and members of the Manufacturers' Association, and the Southern States Industrial Council? If you prick him, does he not bleed? If you tickle him, does he not laugh? If you poison him, does he not die? And if you wrong him, will you not arouse his passion until he becomes resentful?

Did I say it was a cheap, common argument? Yes; that is exactly what I said, and that is exactly what it is. And no one knows this better than those who are making the argument. They cannot plead ignorant. They know that Americans—and there are no better Americans in America than our laboring class—do not fight for love of money but for love of country. They know—whether it is right or wrong—that there never has been any relationship between the industrial wage scale, salaries, dividends and profits, and the soldier's pay. Probably we should change our policy and require all classes, during grave emergencies, to stand upon the same footing. If we do make a change in our policy, then the change should consist not in commercializing the defense of our country and placing it upon a dollar-and-cent basis but rather in raising all civilian classes, during the emergency, up to the high patriotic level of the soldier. If the soldier fights for love of country, then there is strong and persuasive argument that we who stay at home should work for love of country.

But until we do change our policy, no one has the right to single out and point the finger of scorn at labor. Let me make this proposition, which is made on the Scriptural authority of letting the one who is without fault cast the first stone: That members of the Manufacturers' Association, the members of the Southern States Industrial Council, those who criticize Mr. Roosevelt for advocating limiting, during the emergency, net incomes to \$25,000 per year, and all others who have given heed to the spurious argument, who are willing to limit their incomes to bed and board and \$21 per month—which is the pay of the selectees—be permitted, without restraint, to throw all the rocks at labor they desire; otherwise quit their rock throwing.

If this proposition is accepted, then, in my opinion, rock throwing on this score will cease.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is important to the men who are serving in the armed forces of the United States. Their families are also directly interested in our dealing fairly with our soldiers. I am sure that the committee by bringing this legislation to the House today is acting in the best interest of the Nation. We owe a duty to these men who are protecting our Republic, and we must give them every consideration.

On March 23, during House debate, I called to the attention of the able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. MAY] the need for raising the basic pay of those who fight for America in this terrible struggle.

During further discussion in this chamber on the subject on March 28, I commended the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] for presenting such a measure. At that time I said:

Every excess in the operation of government here at home lessens by just that much what we give to our soldiers at the fighting front.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that Congress will speedily send to the President an adequate and fair measure as a further proof of our intention to successfully prosecute the war.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill embodies the provisions of a bill which I introduced over a year ago, the first pay-raise bill for soldiers and sailors in the country. It is my primary interest to see this bill passed and to see that the base pay is increased from \$21 to \$42 per month.

On June 15, 1941, I made a nation-wide radio address in which I outlined for the very first time the proposal to double the base pay of enlisted men in the Army and Navy. I was most happy to see these same provisions become the fundamental part of the bill S. 2025.

Since that time much legislation for the benefit of our soldiers and sailors has been introduced. I have welcomed and approved proposals for higher base pay raises than the one I made. However, in making the original appeal I decided some definite system should be set up, some principle be established so it would reach down to the great rank and file of the men in the lowest grades of pay.

The bill we are now considering does exactly what I wanted in the first place. I am more than pleased and complimented that the distinguished members of the Committee on Military Affairs have seen fit to include in S. 2025 the provisions of the Hall bill which was the very first to call for doubling the base pay of soldiers and sailors of our armed forces, namely, from \$21 to \$42 per month.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

That, for the purpose of computing the annual pay of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Marine Corps below the grade of brigadier general; of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey below the grade of rear admiral; and of the Public Health Service below the grade of assistant to the Surgeon General, pay periods are prescribed, and the base pay for each is fixed as follows:

The first period, \$1,800; the second period, \$2,000; the third period, \$2,400; the fourth period, \$3,000; the fifth period \$3,500; and the sixth period, \$4,000.

The pay of the sixth period shall be paid to colonels of the Army, captains of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade; to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, and lieutenant commanders of the line and Engineer Corps of the Coast Guard who have completed 30 years' service; and to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army when not holding rank above that of colonel.

The pay of the fifth period shall be paid to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the sixth period; and to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who have completed 23 years' service.

The pay of the fourth period shall be paid to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fifth period; to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who have completed 17 years' service.

The pay of the third period shall be paid to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fourth period; to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who have completed 10 years' service.

The pay of the second period shall be paid to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the third period; and to second lieutenants of the Army, ensigns of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed 5 years' service; and to contract surgeons serving full time.

The pay of the first period shall be paid to all other officers whose pay is provided for in this section.

Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks shall, for the purposes of this act, be considered officers of such grades or ranks while holding such temporary appointments.

Every officer paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his period for each 3 years of service up to 30 years.

For officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.). For officers in the service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and also 75 percent of all other periods of time during which they have held commissions as officers

of the Organized Militia between January 21, 1903, and July 1, 1916, or of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, or the National Naval Volunteers since June 3, 1916, shall be included in the computation. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this act or as may otherwise be provided by law: *Provided*, That in computing for any purpose the length of service of any officer who was appointed to the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy, after August 24, 1912, the time spent at such academy shall not be counted.

The provisions of this act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in the Army or in the other services mentioned in the title of this act, but whose pay under existing law is an amount equivalent to that of a commissioned officer of one of the above grades, those receiving the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, being classified as in the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively.

Sec. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 percent and the base pay of any commissioned officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be increased by 10 percent for any period of service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the Department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, which increases in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That the percent increases herein authorized shall be included in computing increases in pay for aviation and submarine duty: *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect 12 months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my very great appreciation of the fact that this bill is about to become law. I believe we all want the pay of the enlisted men and certainly the pay of some of the officers should be increased. I also wish to speak a word of appreciation of the remarkable and heroic work done by the Army nurses in the Philippines, the Bataan Peninsula, and in Corregidor. They undoubtedly saved many lives and performed their duties under tremendous hardship. We know that three of the nurses were injured. I am particularly glad that pay increases are granted for the nurses in this bill.

Certainly this bill is a matter of partial justice to our Army and Navy. The country demands great sacrifices of them. And the country owes them a great debt.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an inquiry to clarify a matter, at least in my own mind.

On page 34, in lines 18, 19, and 20, these offshore increases are made effective as of December 7, 1941. With this I am in full accord. Then on page 59, line 3, the bill carries this provision:

No back pay or allowances shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

I do not understand how you can make these increases retroactive to December 7 and then in this language state that these payments shall not be made.

Mr. BROOKS. The first provision to which the gentleman refers expressly states that those engaged in overseas and sea duty shall receive their pay. The other refers to pay and allowances, and is in the pay and allowances groups.

Mr. PACE. Would not making an increase retroactive to December 7 certainly be in the nature of back pay? If you are now going to pay a soldier an increased amount, that he otherwise could not receive except under this bill, and make it retroactive to December 7, it certainly would be an accumulation of back pay, it seems to me.

Mr. BROOKS. Personally, I have no objection to any change the gentleman may suggest, but when a law, as does this, states specifically that a payment shall be made, and then in general terms elsewhere states that back pay and allowances shall not be given, the specific provision takes precedence over the general provision.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the difficulty comes from failing to understand the technical meaning of the terms "pay" and "allowances" as used in this bill. "Pay" means base pay. "Allowances" means allowances for rental and for subsistence. Therefore, these special things such as the bonus, as it might be called, for flying pay or foreign pay or off-shore pay or sea pay do not count as actual pay under the text of this bill. It is an additional amount. It is an allowance which is in the form of a bonus for a particular or extra-hazardous service rendered. The part of the bill the gentleman referred to as speaking about pay refers only to base pay. The gentleman will find that allowances relate only to subsistence and rental allowances.

Mr. PACE. The trouble is that section 2 calls it "pay," stating that the base pay shall be increased 20 percent.

Mr. KILDAY. During that time.

Mr. PACE. Therefore, it becomes 120 percent, and certainly it is still pay.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not think the gentleman will find that the difficulty will arise of which he speaks, in addition to what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has said of the special provision as to this allowance. I do not think there is any danger of that happening at all, because the meaning of pay and allowances is well understood in the Comptroller's office and everywhere else.

Mr. PACE. While I cannot agree with your distinction, at the same time I am willing to accept your statement and that of the gentleman from Louisiana as to the purpose and intent of the committee in the use of this apparently inconsistent language.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, those serving in grades

corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant of the Army shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively, unless entitled to the pay of a higher period under the provisions of section 14 of this act. Such officers whenever entitled to Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, shall receive as longevity pay, in addition to base pay, an increase thereof at the percent and time rates up to 30 years provided in section 1 of this act. In computing the increase of pay for each period of 3 years' service, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the Officers' Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, when confirmed in grade and qualified for all general service.

Members of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act who shall become entitled to Federal pay for a continuous period of less than 1 month at the rates fixed for the regular services shall receive such pay for each day of such period, and the 31st day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

Payments authorized under the provisions of the preceding paragraph may include the entire amount lawfully accruing to such persons as pay, allowances, and mileage on account of such service, and, including pay and mileage for their return home, may be paid to them during said period and prior to their departure from the camp or other place at which such service is performed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 35, line 15, after "National Guard", insert a comma and the words "National Guard of the United States."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a corrective amendment designed to include among those entitled to receive longevity pay men who have served in the National Guard of the United States. Up until a few months ago the United States Army and the War Department always considered that an officer of the National Guard of the United States on inactive service in the National Guard was entitled to longevity pay. It so happened that a ruling of the Comptroller General, based on previous court decisions, held that since the National Guard of the United States was not spelled out in legislation, these men could not receive the longevity pay the War Department and the National Guard Bureau had always accorded them.

I am informed by the members of the National Guard Bureau of the War Department that they have always considered these men as reserve officers in the National Guard of the United States, who are not assigned to active duty in the State National Guard units, as regular officers of the Reserve components of the armed forces. Many of them have been and are being called into active duty now. Always these men have been subject to call by the United States Army and were required to maintain training and to attend camps.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman is corrective of what seems to be an oversight in the bill, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Does not the gentleman believe that perhaps he should also include the inactive National Guard by name? I understand a situation has developed in the last few weeks in which the National Guard of the United States, those officers who are not assigned to any particular National Guard outfit but who hold federally recognized commissions, are affected by the gentleman's amendment.

Then there is an additional one, the inactive National Guard, where the man is not on active duty with some organization but is not in the technical category of the National Guard of the United States. So perhaps the gentleman would like to include the National Guard of the United States and the inactive National Guard.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would rather have another amendment about that. I have investigated this matter personally. I know the members of the National Guard of the United States are recognized as being Reserve officers in the sense of the term.

I thank the chairman of the committee for accepting this amendment, which will equitably correct this longevity-pay situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The term "dependent" as used in the succeeding sections of this act shall include at all times and in all places a lawful wife and unmarried children under 21 years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term "children" shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: On page 36, section 4, insert a new paragraph at the end thereof as follows:

"The determination of the fact of dependency under the provisions of this act shall be made by the head of the department concerned or by such subordinate as he may designate, and such determination so made shall be final and conclusive."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to make the determination or the finding of the Navy, War, Coast Guard, or Coast and Geodetic Survey, official, final, and conclusive with reference to dependents.

In other words, it keeps the Comptroller General, who may take 6 months or a year, from concluding that the facts did not justify the Navy Department or the War Department or the department concerned in making such finding.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman confident that the heads of those respective departments will achieve uniformity in interpretation of the word "dependents"?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They will do it far better by this method than to have it done by the Comptroller General 6 months or 8 months or a year later after allotments and allowances have been paid.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At least it can be said that the Comptroller General was uniform in his treatment of the officers of all the services.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all, for the simple reason that each case depends upon the facts surrounding it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Surely.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And the War Department could say under a given state of facts that they think the designation of a dependent is all right and the Comptroller General might say 6 months later that he does not agree with the War Department, and then what becomes of your paymaster? Your paymaster is held responsible. I may say that this amendment is submitted at the request of the Bureau of Navigation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not surprised.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman if his amendment takes care of children physically handicapped beyond the age of 21?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The law defines exactly what constitutes dependency and I do not deal with that at all. I say that when the enlisted man designates someone as dependent and then the head of that department recognizes that designation, it is binding, final, and conclusive and cannot be disputed 6 months or a year later by the Comptroller General saying that the head of the department did not have the facts to justify it.

Now, if you do not adopt some amendment of this sort, then paymasters are going to hesitate to make payments that should be made until the Comptroller rules and holds that the designation is final and conclusive.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that should receive very careful consideration by the House before it is adopted. We considered this question in the subcommittee which worked on this bill and went into it very thoroughly and rejected it in the subcommittee. It would revert to a system that was in existence in the Army for many, many years and under which one of the worst abuses ever known in the military history of this country grew up. It would permit the heads of

the departments to make determinations which would be finally binding on the Government.

The case of the dependents of the enlisted man would not make so much difference here. This is a case involving, primarily, the officers of the Army. There would be two ways to compensate officers. One would be a lump sum for rank and responsibility and the other on base pay plus allowances for subsistence and rental based upon whether or not the officer has dependents or is entitled to allowances for dependents.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. In just a moment. Let me make this observation:

For many years we have proceeded under the system of pay and allowances and when entitled to allowances they go up to \$120 a month for rent in the case of certain officers and for subsistence.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Texas, that he is somewhat confused. It applies to enlisted men, to the fathers and mothers and to anybody who is dependent upon the enlisted man.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not yield for a speech. It is exactly what I said in the beginning. It applies to the enlisted men, yes, but that is not the important place where it applies, because the allowance for the enlisted man does not constitute the principal question, nor do dependents, in most instances, affect the pay of enlisted men.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia rose.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not yield further. It applies in all its importance in the case of officers. The adoption of this amendment will lead back to the system that we had for years and under which many persons not entitled to be so considered became dependents. Now the Comptroller General of the United States—and we all have confidence in Mr. Lindsay Warren—requires an affidavit setting out the circumstances surrounding the officer and with the evidence to sustain the status of the dependent as a dependent of the officer. Then the Comptroller General, in accordance with his judicial determination, finds whether or not the evidence sustains the claim. You thereby relieve the services then of all this danger. I say to you that the War Department does not want this responsibility and specifically requested that we not put the responsibility on the Secretary of War, stating that he does not have the means or the facilities at his disposal to make such a determination. If the Bureau of Navigation wants it, I may say that they failed to come before our committee and request it. This is a matter that has received very careful consideration by your committee. You have here a most technical and a most involved bill. We worked on the bill diligently, and I appeal to you not to upset the work that the committee has done. We have gone into these matters and considered them and gone into the background and the reason this was placed

under the Comptroller General rather than under the heads of the departments, and the reason is a very cogent one. I appeal to the House not to adopt this amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. In that respect I may say that while the subcommittee was meeting there was a representative of the Navy Department there, and nothing was said in reference to the Navy desiring this change. There was a representative of the Army there, and that representative specifically asked that that burden be not placed back on the Army, to bring back the excesses they had had in the past in the Army.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. He said they were not prepared and did not have the facilities to make such a determination.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And may I call attention to the fact that there is already a law on the books making such a decision binding on the Navy and conclusive in these matters.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, I understand it is a question of a matter of sea duty. There has been such a decision, but that is not comparable to the case in which every son-in-law living with an officer may be held to be a dependent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, the gentleman keeps talking about sons-in-law. Section 4 defines the status of a dependent. It sets out exactly who are dependents. When an enlisted man says his father or his mother is dependent upon him and he wants a part of the \$42 a month set aside for them, he has that right.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, just a second. The gentleman is talking about a different bill entirely. The gentleman is talking about a bill that has just gone before the Military Affairs Committee this morning, and it does not refer to his amendment at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe we would better get a thorough understanding of the meaning of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. May I go back a moment and reminisce? When we wrote the act of 1922 we imbedded, for the first time, in the pay schedule of officers a varying degree of allowances for dependents. In other words a captain with a dependent normally gets more pay under existing law than a captain without dependents. It is the only provision of the existing law which I opposed, because I think that we should pay for service and not for the size of families. Enlisted men and their families are not interested in this thing in the slightest degree. There is nothing in the present law or in this bill which pretends to give the enlisted man additional pay because he has a wife and child. The enlisted man, contrary to the conception of the gentleman from Georgia, can go to his paymaster now and say, "I want all but \$2 of my pay sent back home to my wife and child." He does not have to prove that his wife is a dependent, but

an officer has to prove that his wife is dependent upon him, that his mother is dependent upon him, that his children are dependent upon him, before he is entitled to the additional pay for dependents. You propose to leave that for the Secretary of War for the Army, for the Secretary of the Navy for the Navy, and some other officer for the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Instantly you will find channels of favoritism at work in each of these departments. The Secretary of War cannot dig into the facts in all of these cases, nor can the Secretary of the Navy. Reports must be made to him. By whom? By boards of examining officers. If a claimant has a friend on the board, that friend will say, "Yes. Captain Smith has a dependent mother."

You had better leave it to the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CLAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty, below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence. The value of one subsistence allowance is hereby fixed at 70 cents per day. To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first, second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: *Provided*, That an officer with no dependents shall receive one subsistence allowance in lieu of the above allowances.

SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be \$60 per month to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be \$75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be \$90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be \$105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be \$120 per month.

To an officer having no dependents, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be \$45 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of said allowance shall be \$60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of said allowance shall be \$75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of said allowance shall be \$90 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of said allowance shall be \$105 per month.

No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on

field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable, in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned, including adjunct forces thereof.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that under the paragraph last read there is a substantial increase in the quarters and subsistence allowance for officers of from \$30 to \$50 a month. Of course, under the bill there is an increase in the pay and allowances of second lieutenants to nearly \$300. Do you know how much increase you are giving to the private under this bill after he has been in the service 12 months? Exactly \$2. The fathers and mothers of this Nation think that you are doubling the pay of their boys. Now they get \$21 a month for three months, \$30 a month for 9 months and \$40 thereafter. Under this bill they would get \$42, or an increase of \$2. That is because this bill a little further on repeals the law you passed last year which said that after a boy had been in a training camp 12 months and was moved to the battle-front he should be paid an additional \$10 a month. For my part, I still think that he should be paid that extra \$10 a month.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman understands, of course, that under existing law, which includes what was known as the Leavy amendment written into the Selective Training and Service Act there are different grades of base pay for enlisted men.

Mr. PACE. I understand that.

Mr. MAY. Some of them for a few months receive the low base pay of \$21. Others receive \$30.

Mr. PACE. I understand that.

Mr. MAY. What we are doing here is equalizing it for all.

Mr. PACE. What you are doing here is repealing the extra pay that this Congress voted that those boys should have when they moved to the battle line. That was exactly the purpose the Congress had in mind in passing the act last year, which said that after the boys had been in service 12 months they should be paid an extra \$10. I think that with the increased allowance, quarters, subsistence, and everything else that you are giving to the officers, you should at least give the boys with the guns an increase of \$12 a month.

Mr. MAY. While I am not defending the officers, does the gentleman know that the officers pay for their own uniforms and pay for certain other things, and that the privates receive their uniforms and all their keep?

Mr. PACE. Oh, yes; indeed. I know also that under this bill an ensign or a

second lieutenant gets approximately \$250 a month, that you are increasing them substantially \$600 a year, and that you are increasing the pay of the man with the gun \$24 a year under this bill. I say it is wrong. I have an amendment on the desk, to page 58, to strike out the effort in this bill to repeal the provision of the act of 1941 which provides that when these boys have received their training during the 12-month period that they shall receive this extra compensation of \$10 per month.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PACE. Of course.

Mr. MAY. Then the gentleman, according to his amendment, would put them back to where they would receive \$21 and give them \$10?

Mr. PACE. It does not. It simply strikes out two lines on page 58 where you seek to repeal section 8 of the act of 1941. If my amendment is adopted, the act of 1941, section 8, which says that after they have been in the service 12 months they shall receive an extra \$10 per month, will remain in force, and it means that after they have completed their training they will receive \$52 a month instead of \$42 a month, or an increase of \$10 a month under this bill.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman does not realize that there is a 20-percent increase for combat troops?

Mr. PACE. That is exactly right. I understand that. Certainly there can be no criticism of that increase at all. But I am taking the position that under this bill for the boys who have been in the service for 12 months—they know if their fathers and mothers do not—that all they get under this bill is \$2 a month increase.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman knows that all of the battle lines are outside of the United States.

Mr. PACE. I hope they stay there.

Mr. BROOKS. We want to keep them there. In World War No. 1, when we went across to France we received a 10-percent increase. We provide a 20-percent increase for the enlisted men.

Mr. PACE. That is right, and 10 percent for the officers.

Mr. BROOKS. Twenty percent for the enlisted men. I notice the committee made this change: The enlisted longevity pay was at the rate of 10 percent for the first 4 years and 5 percent for each 4 years thereafter. We changed that so it would be 5 percent for each 3 years up to 50 percent whereas the law presently allows them only 25 percent.

Mr. PACE. What longevity pay does the average boy who goes into the Army now expect to be able to realize? None. That provision will not benefit any of the millions of boys now entering the service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the

Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be \$6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be \$8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.

Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of vice admiral, officers of the Army serving in the grade of lieutenant general, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of \$500 per year. Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as Chief of Staff of the Army, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of \$2,200 per year.

SEC. 8. Warrant officers (junior grade) of the Army except first mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service, and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive the base pay of the first period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of \$1,950 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than 10 years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of \$2,100 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, 77th Cong.).

Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after 10 years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with creditable records on the active list, after 20 years of commissioned service, shall receive the base pay of the fourth period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the fourth period.

Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his period for each 3 years of service, not exceeding 30 years. Such service shall be: Active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That commissioned warrant officers shall be credited only with all commissioned service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including commissioned service in the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard.

When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of \$458.33 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above \$458.33.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for the splendid piece of work it did in bringing before the House this piece of legislation. I shall support it as it is. I have a suggestion, however, I should like for the committee to take into consideration. I have always been for the underdog. In this case I believe there is one group that has been left out, a group that I consider the underdog.

I read from page 41, line 12, of the bill the following language:

Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after 10 years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

Personally, I should like to see inserted after the word "service" the words "and bandmasters", thus putting all the bandmasters in this class.

I ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if I am right in stating that a captain receives \$200 a month plus a certain additional amount for rent and subsistence.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is correct. Mr. SNYDER. A bandmaster receives \$175 a month. Am I correct?

Mr. MAY. I do not know what the bandmasters receive. It is set out in the table.

Mr. SNYDER. It is \$175 a month. Mr. Chairman, in this above all times the band is called upon to do more than ever to arouse and maintain morale. The life of the bandmaster is one of continual work. Not only that, but certain social obligations are required of bandmasters. It is almost impossible for them to keep up with the situation on a salary of \$175 a month.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to tell the gentleman that I heartily favor his proposal to give them better pay.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman tell us how close to real combat the bandmaster gets?

Mr. SNYDER. In these days of aerial warfare he gets as close as a lot of generals, captains, and others.

Mr. DITTER. Does the gentleman mean he actually enters into combat duty?

Mr. SNYDER. It is combat duty, in my judgment, the same as that of any other group within a radius of 100 or 200 miles of the real shooting.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that not so many months ago Congress passed a bill giving a commissioned status to bandmasters, but it was vetoed by the President?

Mr. SNYDER. That is true. That, however, does not interfere with our putting this phrase "and bandmasters" in this particular bill.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to the combat duty of bands, is it not a fact that members of the band act as stretcher bearers and get very close, indeed, to the real action?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this suggestion to the Committee for its consideration. I think it would be only fair and just to insert the words "and bandmasters" in this bill at this time. I understand, of course, that the United States Army Band, the Navy Band, and the Marine Band here in Washington and the West Point Band have already been taken care of under certain language; but bands at great cantonments, like Fort Benning, a big band that has worked as many hours as any other one group, and bands in some of the other large camps—Fort Bragg and Fort Sam Houston—should be taken care of.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I arise at this time to offer a unanimous-consent request.

On page 60, after line 9, it is my intention to offer an amendment providing for a new section in regard to longevity credit to commissioned officers of the armed forces for prior enlisted and commissioned service.

In the event that the Committee should adopt my amendment on page 60, after line 9, it will nullify the language on page 42, line 11, after the word "Reserve", to and including the period on line 15.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the subject matter of longevity affecting commissioned officers promoted from the ranks

may receive full consideration, at this time I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to offer both amendments at the same time when we reach page 60 after the reading of line 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, \$138; enlisted men of the second grade, \$114; enlisted men of the third grade, \$96; enlisted men of the fourth grade, \$78; enlisted men of the fifth grade, \$66; enlisted men of the sixth grade, \$48; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, \$42. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of \$126.

For purposes of pay enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard shall be distributed in the several pay grades by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.

Every enlisted man paid under the provision of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his grade for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

On page 42, line 25, after the word "grade", strike out "\$48" and insert "\$54."

On page 43, line 1, after the word "grade", strike out "\$42" and insert "\$50."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to raise the minimum pay of the enlisted men in our armed forces to \$50 a month.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. For what purpose?

Mr. BOREN. For a question. Does the gentleman's amendment take care of the man in the ranks? The enlisted soldier and sailor? That is what I want done.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; that is the object of it. This amendment would raise the base pay of the enlisted men to at least \$50 a month. Even then the man in the rank and file, the man who is carrying the gun, the enlisted man in a tank, a plane, a ship, or a submarine, will not draw anything like the amount of pay the man gets who is working in a shipyard or a factory. Congress failed during the World War to raise the base pay of the enlisted men, with the result that we had a fight for adjusted compensation—which its enemies called a bonus—that lasted for more than 15

years after the war closed. We finally paid it. Added to what the men were drawing while in the service, it made their base pay average about \$60 a month.

These men probably need this money worse today than they will when the war is over. By raising this amount to \$50 we will be paying them more nearly what they were making in private life, and what we are paying men in industry. The average wage in industry today is above 75 cents an hour. These men in the armed forces drill 10 hours a day, they are on duty subject to call 24 hours a day; but suppose they work only 10 hours a day; even then we would not be paying them anything like the wages that men receive in industry. Many of these men leave businesses, they leave professions, they leave farms where they are needed and where there is nobody to take their places, they leave salaries that far exceed this amount, even after allowing for board and uniforms.

Remember these men never strike. They constitute the finest fighting force a nation ever had. Whenever it is deemed necessary for them to do so, they stay on duty day and night. They get no time and a half for overtime. They get no double pay for Sundays and holidays.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman realize that when we refer to \$40 a month for the buck private he does not receive the \$40 a month after you take into consideration all deductions?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entirely right. He remembers the old song the boys used to sing during the first World War about receiving "\$30 every month, deducting \$29." I know something about what those boys had deducted from their pay. By the time it was all deducted they had very little, if anything, left.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman tell us how much is being deducted at the present time?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I cannot say, but I presume it is about what it was in the last World War; and if so, they will not have much left, even if you pay them \$50 a month.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Are any deductions at all taken out of a soldier's pay other than that which he authorizes?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; but he is required to authorize a great many deductions, and they are taken out of his pay.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What section is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Section 9.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman provides the same pay for the sixth and seventh grades?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I change only the last two.

Mr. MOTT. Fifty dollars for a private and \$50 for a private first class?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; under my amendment an enlisted man of the sixth grade would receive \$54 a month and an enlisted man of the seventh grade, \$50. In other words, I take the man who is taken into the Army now, who is taken out of the factory, off the farm, or out of the law office, out of school, or out of the store, and start him at \$50 a month.

Mr. MOTT. All right. What does the gentleman's amendment give the private first class?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I leave that just exactly as it is. If the gentleman from Oregon wants to change it, he can offer an amendment.

Mr. MOTT. I am referring to the provisions of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I have changed only two grades. I told the gentleman, and they are the last two. What I am really after is to raise the pay of these men who are going into the Army now, who are not being paid an amount commensurate with the services they are rendering.

Mr. MOTT. I understand the gentleman's position and I agree with it. I am going to support his amendment. I am asking if his amendment provides the same pay for the sixth and seventh grades.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No. I said enlisted men of the sixth grade are raised to \$54 a month and enlisted men of the seventh grade, the buck privates, are raised to \$50.

Mr. MOTT. That answers my question and I am heartily in favor of the gentleman's amendment. Without such an amendment the bill is far short of what it ought to be and far short of what the people of the country expected it to be.

The bill, as reported, is of considerable value to the enlisted men who have served less than a year and of very definite value to those who have served less than 4 months. To those of the two lower grades who have served more than a year, however, the bill, without this amendment offers very little relief. As a matter of fact it gives privates and privates first class and apprentice seamen and seamen second class a raise of only \$2 per month.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], on the other hand, provides a substantial increase and changes entirely the picture presented by the table in the committee's report. If this amendment is adopted the table showing the increase in the

base pay of enlisted men will read as follows:

Grade	Present base pay ¹	Proposed base pay
1. Master sergeant; chief petty officer	\$126	\$138
(1a. Acting chief petty officer, Navy and Coast Guard only)	99	126
2. First or technical sergeant; petty officer, first class	84	114
3. Sergeant; petty officer, second class	72	96
4. Sergeant; petty officer, third class	60	78
5. Corporal; seaman, first class	54	66
6. Private, first class; seaman, second class	36	54
7. Private; apprentice seaman	30	50
Seventh grade men with less than 4 months' service	21	(²)

¹Add \$10 per month to total pay after 12 months' service.

²Eliminate.

The enlisted men, who are the backbone of the armed services, and without whom we could have neither Army nor Navy, are certainly entitled to this much consideration at the hands of the Congress, and I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Mott] for his splendid contribution. He has explained the situation most clearly, and has demonstrated very concisely both the necessity for and the effects of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment was adopted on a roll call by a vote of 332 to 28, or more than 11 to 1, and to express the hope that the Senate will approve it unanimously.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I read in my home town paper, the Livingston Enterprise, just before I came over to the floor of the House that 101 men were cited by the Army for actions in the defense of the Philippines. I am very proud to say that 1 of these 101 was Pvt. Charles Ball—William Ball, father—of Harlem, Mont., in my district. I know the father and son very well. They are fine people.

I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for offering almost the same amendment I offered to the original conscription bill when that bill was before the House. I recall distinctly the words I used then. I said the time would come when this Congress would raise the pay of the boys we were taking out of their places of business, out of their homes, out of their employment, and putting into the Army. I am glad to see others now coming along the same line. I believe the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi voted for my amendment, and I can see many others here who did.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania over here made the same inquiry when I offered that amendment that he made here today.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If I recall correctly, I supported the gentleman's amendment. I congratulate him on pioneering in this field.

Let me call attention to the fact that right today workers in the Ford Motor Co. are demanding an increase of \$1 a day in their pay.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman. I may say that I am going to support the gentleman's amendment. If the gentleman had not offered it, I had intended to offer it myself. I congratulate the gentleman on beating me to it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I also congratulate the gentleman from Montana on proposing to offer this amendment. I recall very well that when the Selective Training and Service Act was passed the gentleman from Montana offered a similar amendment and that it received heavy support, including my own.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. I may say to the gentleman I recall that he voted for it, too.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Mississippi said that, speaking of raising the pay of bandmasters, we ought to think of the man with the gun. We are thinking of the man with the gun.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The man who has to face the bullets.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SACKS. The chairman of the committee a few moments ago said no deductions were made in the soldier's pay. There are deductions at the present time, a deduction of \$1.50 for laundry and deductions for insurance and other little items, the total amounting to about \$7 a month.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to be correct in his statement.

Mr. SACKS. I am.

Mr. MAY. I did not say that no deductions are now being made. I asked the gentleman from Mississippi if he knew of any deductions made by the Army that were not authorized by the soldier. That is what I said. I did not say there were no deductions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offered two other amendments to the conscription bill, but they were also voted down. I regret that such action was taken by the House then. We wrote into the bill that when the draftees returned home after having served, they could only enforce their rights in the Federal courts. I wanted to give the right to the draftees to enforce their rights in the district courts of the several States as well; in other words, give the State district courts concurrent jurisdiction with the Federal courts. That amendment was turned down. I think it was a mistake.

In addition, I tried to amend the bill so as to compel a private employer to reemploy a draftee. This amendment was turned down. Both these amendments should have been adopted.

I hope the time will come as we go along with this war when we more fully realize the necessity for taking care of the men who are going to have to do the shooting and the dying, that these rights will be given our service men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, it would be indeed a spectacular if not a ridiculous performance if the House of Representatives undertook to base an Army pay bill, or any part of it, on the fact that somebody in the country is making more profits out of the war program than he ought to make, or that somebody in the country is receiving higher wages than he should receive.

This committee has studied all the provisions of the legislation now under consideration. We gave time and attention to the recommendations of the interdepartmental pay committee. We found in the hearings and in the consideration of the legislation that there were many inconsistencies in the various grades of the lower groups of our soldiers. This is particularly true when you consider the fact that under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act the original base pay fixed for the inductees was \$21 per month. I was opposed to that low rate of pay from the very beginning, and by reason of an amendment that was written into the Selective Service Act on the floor of this House, just as the pending amendment is proposed to be inserted, there was created a condition which brought many inequalities, and by the pending bill as written by your Military Affairs Committee, we have equalized the pay of all enlisted men. So it would now seem unwise to adopt the pending amendment which provides raises in only two grades out of a total of seven, so I oppose the amendment.

Later, the House of Representatives very appropriately wrote into the legislation a provision that at the end of 12 months of service the pay should be raised from \$21 to \$30 a month. This was known as the Leavy amendment. Now we propose here to provide that only two certain grades of pay shall be raised without reference to the seven grades that are involved. One is raised \$6 by the Rankin amendment and another is raised \$8, I believe.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I did not base this—

Mr. MAY. I am yielding only for a question.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman spoke a moment ago about this being based on profits being made or on wages earned by others. This is based on the economic situation. The

reason the people in industry are demanding these wages is because the cost of living has gone up, and for that reason I am asking that the pay of these soldiers be raised. Then, in addition, I am trying to forestall the fight for adjusted compensation that we went through before.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman.

When you consider that foreign service is added on top of the \$42 under the provisions of this bill, every man in the United States Army among the enlisted group, will receive \$50.40 per month. This is the highest pay in any army in all the world except Australia. Australia, of course, pays a little higher.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi ought to be voted down.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTPHIN to the amendment of Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: In the last line of the amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi, strike out "\$50" and insert "\$60."

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, every day we hear the statement made that we must do everything for the gallant fellows in the service who are serving on land, sea, and in the air. There are many hardship cases today occurring throughout the land, attributable to the patriotism of many people who have dependents at home. Each and every one of you who has seen military service, and a great many of you have, knows that we cannot pay these men too much and we should at least make it possible for their loved ones at home to be able to live in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTPHIN. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I am sure the gentleman will be pleased to hear that today we started consideration of a bill to take care of the dependents of these men, and they will be taken care of in much better shape than they were during the last war.

Mr. SUTPHIN. They should be taken care of in a much better way than in the last war and that is a reason why my amendment should be adopted.

FOR INCREASING PAY OF SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege in the recent past to visit many of these Army camps and Marine Corps camps. The spirit and the morale among the boys is very high. They are willing to make any sacrifice that is necessary to be made. They all want to render overseas service if possible. They are anxious to go, they are anxious to get into the fight, and they will do everything they can to save our country. I have never witnessed such demonstrations of patriotism.

I do not believe any country on earth ever had a more intelligent, a healthier, or a better army than we have today. It is my belief, however, that we should raise the pay above what they are now receiving. I personally favor the amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I think that is a good amendment, and I hope it is adopted.

In the Army, when one goes in, whether he is inducted or enlists, the first thing he is asked to do is to sign up for insurance, and pressure is brought to bear on him to take the limit of \$10,000, the cost of which is \$6.50 per month on an average. He does not have to pay it then. It is deducted from his pay at the end of the month. In addition to this, he has to pay for having his clothes cleaned and pressed. He pays for this himself. In addition to this he pays for any repairs or alterations to his clothes and shoes, and must, of course, keep them in fine condition. In addition to this he pays his laundry bills, he pays for his entertainment—picture shows—which oftentimes does not amount to a great deal, but a dollar or two a month out of \$21 or \$42 amounts to quite a lot. Furthermore, these camps are not all well located. They are not close to good-sized towns where transportation facilities are available. They must use expensive busses and taxicabs. It would surprise you to go to some of these camps and see hundreds of taxicabs that have come from a distance of 25 or 30 or 50 miles in order to get some of these boys when they leave on week-end passes or evening passes.

Last Sunday I saw boys lined up by the hundreds and thousands next to a Marine Corps camp. They could not possibly get transportation at all. Everyone who came along in his own automobile picked up as many as he could carry, but there were thousands of them that could not get to town because of lack of transportation, and those that did paid well for their transportation. In addition to this, they are required to buy bonds and stamps if it is at all possible for them to do so or be called a slacker in disguise, because they are told that although they are working for their country, yet the country needs money, and it takes money to run this war and it is necessary to put in some money, so they have not anything left. In addition to that, a bill is being considered now for allotments to dependents, and I presume that will be predicated, as in the preceding war, on the amount that the soldier himself puts up. The soldier puts up a dollar and the Government puts up a dollar. There is another opportunity for a deduction. I think in all fairness to those in what may be called the low-income groups in the service, they should certainly have their pay raised to the amount asked by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi) there were—ayes 102, noes 40.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 10. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed \$5 per day: *Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe. These regulations shall be uniform for all the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military, naval, or Coast Guard service of the United States having a dependent as defined in section 4 of this Act, shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted men shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence, shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-duty stations in a pay status: *Provided*, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense.

An enlistment allowance equal to \$50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of 3 months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of \$25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of 3 months from the date of his discharge: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the provisions of the Act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, 77th Cong.): *Provided further*, That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter the provisions of this paragraph and of all other laws (including said Public Law 215, 77th Cong.) providing for enlistment allowances, shall be suspended.

Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 43, line 21, after the word "subsistence", insert "transportation during furlough."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, on several different occasions

during the debates on appropriation bills for military matters I have offered this amendment. I believe, however, that this is the one and only place in military legislation where such an amendment can be offered so that it will stick permanently. I was talking with a very good friend of mine back home not long ago. He was a member of the British armed forces during the World War. In discussing the subject of transportation during furlough for men in the armed services, he said: "Do you know that the American armed forces, the soldiers and sailors of the United States, are the only men in the world who do not have transportation furnished by the Government home and back during furlough?" I answered him that although I had heard that report, I was not absolutely certain of it. He insisted that during the World War the members of the British armed forces received their transportation during furlough, and are doing so today. I might also point out that members of the Australian forces and in other dominions throughout the British Empire they are receiving the same thing. I have persistently called to the attention of the committee, and I respectfully call it to your attention today, that it is absolutely necessary to provide transportation for these boys so that they can go back home before they go away and are shipped to the four corners of the world. I entreat the committee at this time to pass this amendment once and for all. I ask you to set up the principle of giving boys in the service free transportation. I do not need to elaborate upon the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] a short time ago when he said that the highways and byways are choked with men in uniform who should have their transportation paid, but who are unable to get their way home because the Government will not supply it. Right in my own family my brother who has been in the service for a year and a half now actually sent home for money not long ago because he was unable to get home when he was offered a furlough and he did not have the funds necessary to buy his train ticket home. This amendment is something which can be considered at this time, and at this time only, because the other bills on which it was offered were usually appropriation bills and proposed legislation on an appropriation bill definitely providing for transportation home was out of order.

I ask that the committee give serious consideration at this time to my amendment.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I am in accord with the gentleman's remarks and I shall support his amendment. In this connection I might add the observation that I am informed that in Germany it is a serious offense to pick up a hitch-hiking soldier on the road, or for a soldier to hitch-hike. Germany pays for the transportation of her soldiers on furlough to prevent their giving military information to strangers. German spy system in this country by picking up

hitch-hiking soldiers is no doubt obtaining considerable information. The gentleman's amendment is a step in the right direction.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman's amendment apply for one furlough during the duration for each soldier?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This will set up a definite policy, which has never been set up by any legislation, to provide transportation for soldiers during furloughs. As I say, it is up to the War Department to do what they want to do with it after the Congress passes it, but it will definitely set up a principle which has never before been incorporated in law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. How many times would a soldier be able to be furloughed during the year?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. As I have said, that is a matter for the War Department to provide. This simply sets up a principle. I ask the committee to give it very serious consideration. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Some of you may recall that we have a Committee on Expenditures in the House, of which I am supposed to be an active member.

I feel at this moment that I should express a little of caution lest our desire to be generous overcomes our judgment. I will not speak wholly to this particular amendment. The Members fully understand it. I was told yesterday of a boy hiking on his furlough from Massachusetts to New Orleans. He said it would take 4 days each way, but that he would have 4 or 5 days at home anyway. This was a case to arouse interest and sympathy and perhaps not too unusual.

I have two reasons for speaking. One is that I have a feeling that we may go too far in our anxiety to do all we should for our soldiers. No one here should proclaim that he is more zealous than others in their attempt to bring proper relief to those selected to serve in our armed forces. We may have some 9,000,000 under arms before we are through, and some very serious thought must be given to expenditures.

She had a portrait of her husband painted. Viewing it she exclaimed, "He did have a very large nose! A large nose is a sign of generosity! Paint the nose a little larger."

We will paint this bill a little larger unless we control our sympathetic emotions. The committee needs real support. They have performed a conscientious service. I will let them oppose this particular amendment if they desire to do so. The other reason I have for speaking may be more of a real criticism. I live close to a camp. I meet many soldiers. The Government has built many beautiful U. S. O. buildings, sometimes many miles from the camp. They

are so beautiful that when I visit them I fear I may drop a cigarette or mutilate something.

I recently noted "no smoking" signs in these buildings. I protested. In reply, they called my attention to a smudge on the floor where someone dropped a cigarette. I could only say, "I hope the whole floor will be covered with smudges and then I will know the boys used it." I used most emphatic words. We must make these buildings give more suitable pleasure to our soldiers. They were not built for parlor games and socialite parties.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] spoke about transportation to and from the camps. I do wish you gentlemen would write to the colonels in charge of those camps and request them to furnish the boys transportation to and from these U. S. O. buildings. The Army has plenty of trucks. It can be done. They could have an M. P. supervise it. There is no good reason, to my mind, for those boys to do so much hitch-hiking for they should have a way of getting back and forth to these buildings which were built at such a very heavy cost, with an average of five paid attendants. I urge more use of them and more suitable methods used to furnish the boys more active amusements and games. Ping Pong seems to be the principal athletic feature.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is aware of the fact, of course, that the War Department has reported to the House Military Affairs Committee that the lowest possible estimate of the cost of this bill will be \$280,000,000 a year, based on an Army of 3,000,000. Now, if you go to 9,000,000 men, you cannot tell how far it will go. The committee is opposing the amendment on which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course, there are many boys who can afford to pay their own expenses on furlough. There are many who cannot. If we could assist those who were really in need of this help, I would be glad to favor such a plan. Again, I rose to speak because of the assignment I hold to be watchful of expenditures.

Do not paint the nose a little larger under the spell of our great desire to be generous to our soldiers. I do not know where the limit is, but certainly the committee will have my support. They have given long and considerate study. Again, will you please write these officers in charge of the camps, to furnish the transportation back and forth to these buildings which I mentioned? That will mean much to the soldier and will not be an expensive way to show our appreciation and desire to make his life endurable.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment, but should it be adopted?

Mr. Chairman, it is a fine thing, a grand thing to aid and assist the men in the service. They need every assistance we can give them; but let me ask the Members if they know where they are leading this Nation? Do any of you know where

the end is going to be? Is it security, or is it bankruptcy?

It is fine for the boys in the Army to get back home; it is fine for them to get back home to vote, but we leave it to the Army to determine how many times a year they may go home, and I regard that your duty to say how many free rides, how many you can pay for.

Since the 22d day of January you have appropriated about \$30,000,000,000 to the Army and the Navy, and the Chief Executive—I do not leave him out. You have placed this money in the hands of the Army and the Navy and Chief Executive and said to them it is their responsibility to spend it. Look at the contracts they have let to these big corporations that are making profits so fabulous they are turning them back to the Treasury because they are ashamed to take them—and rightfully so. But whose responsibility is it to continue to look after the expenditure of these funds? It is your responsibility and mine. You should not have passed such laws. Now be careful what you are doing today.

According to the Treasury statement of May 8 you have taken this country's Treasury to the tune of \$15,178,610,765 in the red since last July 1. Next year you will be \$40,000,000,000 in the red. This means the approach to bankruptcy for America unless you stop it. Then how are you going to get the men equipped to fight? How are you then going to furnish them guns, ammunition, tanks, and airplanes when you bankrupt this Nation? Who will pay the bill? Where is your tax bill? You have got to win this war you are in. It is right to help those boys, but if you fellows are interested now in doing the right thing, bring in some labor legislation so these men who are after the almighty dollar in the labor unions, raking in the fabulous sums, legislation that will set them back a little. Set the manufacturer back and everybody sacrifice. That is your responsibility. But that means votes to give people money. You men are here today because of votes. You have to vote for taxes or else we will have a lost cause that means bankruptcy.

If you want to see this country go forward, if you want to do right by these men who are in the Army, if you want to see that they receive pensions when they return, you must change your course, for they will never receive pensions from a bankrupt Treasury. Men who fought in the former World War will cease to receive their pensions unless you change the course you have charted for America's ship and turn it from the rocks of bankruptcy for which it is now headed.

You come in here filled with the desire to pass legislation you think will get votes. We like votes; we cannot be here if we do not get them; but are votes more valuable to you and your country than keeping your country under the Constitution and laws and liberties we have enjoyed for so many years? This is the most important thing. A dictator is about upon you. We do not want the damn Japs over here running this Nation, but if you break the Nation down financially that is what will happen. Let us get just a little bit of common sense into the things we are trying to do; let

us do the things that are going to win this war. Let us cut down on every unnecessary expenditure for a while and see how that will affect the Treasury. This is your responsibility. Cut out all unnecessary expenditures. You must do it and do it at once to restore confidence to the American public. The New Deal has about wrecked this Nation, and you must get honest-to-goodness men of ability; men of integrity; men of courage; men who love liberty more than office, if this Nation survives. America wake up and elect such men to public office, is my plea, before it is too late—after November will be too late.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

The rates of pay of enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding grades.

SEC. 12. Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.

Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of \$7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding \$6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not

to exceed \$8 per day, or, in lieu thereof, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed \$6 per day.

Travel by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard while on active duty in the Federal service, on commercial aircraft, domestic or foreign, including travel between airports and centers of population or posts of duty when incidental to travel on commercial aircraft, shall be allowed at public expense when authorized or approved by competent authority, and transportation requests for such travel may be issued upon such authorizations. Such expense shall be allowed without regard to comparative costs of transportation by aircraft with other modes of transportation.

Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transportation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who, under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel by privately owned conveyance shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate 3 cents per mile for the same distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926.

When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade, having dependents as defined in section 4 hereof, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for such dependents: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term "permanent station" as used in this section shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects: *And provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

The words "permanent change of station" as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including retired personnel and members of the Reserve components thereof,

in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a Reserve component.

Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

The head of the department concerned may determine what shall constitute a travel status and travel without troops within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage or other travel expenses.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss SUMNER of Illinois: On page 51, line 2, after "expenses", insert a new section 12a, as follows:

"Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be entitled to reimbursement for actual and necessary medical and hospital expenses where such expenses were incurred after the individual's induction into the armed forces and prior to the date of the enactment of this act."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is intended to cover cases similar to the one described in a letter I received last week which, with your permission, I shall read:

DEAR MISS SUMNER: When my soldier husband was home on a furlough, he had an attack of appendicitis and was rushed to a hospital and operated on immediately at St. Mary's Hospital, Kankakee, Ill.

Now the Army informs us that he has to stand his own expense.

You know how much money a private in the Army gets and after all insurance and laundry and other things are paid for there isn't much left.

My husband hasn't any money and I am staying at the home of my parents so I don't know how we will get the bill paid for. The bill is \$177.

I am wondering if you know of any way possible that the Government will help.

These boys have been drafted into the Army and are giving their lives for their country. It seems to me that in an emergency like this the Government should pay the expense as it was impossible for us to get him to an Army hospital.

Hoping that you will look into this matter and that I will hear from you in the near future, I remain. Thanking you.

MRS. ALVIN SCHULER.

ASHKUM, ILL.

I am informed that the Comptroller General has ruled that, if a soldier is absent for more than 24 hours on furlough the Army is not responsible for any medical bills he may contract. There is no remedy in such a case.

It was suggested by the Enlistment Division of The Adjutant General's Office that the soldier nevertheless make a request for payment of his commanding officer so that if and when legislation be enacted it may be on record.

The soldier returning home on furlough is away from the hospital facilities of camp, but he is not returned to his normal ability to pay such expenses in private life. I doubt if the adoption of this amendment, since it is limited to cases where expenses were incurred prior to the enactment of the act raising the

pay, would result in anything but a relatively trivial expense to the Government. To the soldier who has incurred the expense, however, the burden, as this girl indicates, is appalling.

I hope, therefore, that the Congress, in its wisdom, will agree that such claims must in all justice be paid.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that the committee accept this amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In recent months I have received two letters almost identical with the letter that the gentleman has read to the House. I am in favor of the amendment she has offered, and I think it should be adopted.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to inquire if the gentleman construes the amendment to apply to anybody who is on furlough at home, and whether she is also aware that there is hospitalization provided for the men in the camp?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This will apply to cases where it is actually necessary, and by regulation they can construe it to apply to emergency cases.

May I say further that I am not one to encourage either extravagance or generosity in this fateful moment, but it seems to me this is a just and reasonable claim.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Members of the House of an actual experience which will back up the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], and I certainly hope the Committee will adopt it. This has to do with a boy from my district, Corp. Frank E. Hoskins, Jr., of Worthington, Minn.

At this point I wish to insert a letter from Mr. Raymond E. Mork, of Worthington, which presents the facts in the case:

WORTHINGTON, MINN., October 27, 1941.

H. CARL ANDERSEN,

Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: A Mr. Frank E. Hoskins, Sr., who is assistant highway engineer for the county here, had a son who enlisted in the United States Army. The son was Corp. Frank E. Hoskins, Jr., Nineteenth School Squadron, Chanute Field, Rantoul, Ill. Corporal Hoskins joined the Army at the age of 18. On May 3, 1941, about 18 months after enlisting, he was shot by another soldier while engaging in target practice outside of the military field and near Danville, Ill. The target practice was not a part of his Army duties, but was done while he was on leave. After being shot, the other soldiers with him

rushed him to a civilian hospital in Danville, Ill., where an emergency operation was performed and where he died on May 13, 1941.

The doctor and the hospital are now attempting to collect bills totaling \$393.30 from his father on the ground that this boy was a minor. It would be very difficult for the father to raise this money, and I wonder whether there should not be some provision in Army regulations for these expenses to be taken care of. The father states that one of the features advertised at the enlisting post and also mentioned in the Army letters was that complete medical attention would be given those enlisting. As far as I can find out, this boy was in no way blameworthy regarding the accident. If anything could be done to relieve this man from the payment of this large bill, it would be greatly appreciated.

With kindest personal regards,
Very truly yours,

FLYNN & MORK,

By RAYMOND E. MORK.

P. S.—The boy was not on furlough at the time of the accident—just an afternoon off as I understand it. The accident happened about 20 miles from Chanute Field.

R. M.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert a letter from the Surgeon General of the United States Army, in reply to my request as to what prospects the family of Corporal Hoskins had toward receiving payment by the Government of these hospital accounts:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, November 10, 1941.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: Receipt is acknowledged, by reference from The Adjutant General, of your letter of the 31st ultimo, enclosing a communication from Mr. Raymond E. Mork, of Flynn & Mork, lawyers, Worthington, Minn., respecting the payment of charges for the treatment of Corp. Frank E. Hoskins, Jr., on account of gunshot wound incurred May 3, 1941.

Records show that the injury in reference was accidentally incurred while Corporal Hoskins was absent from his post on authorized pass which covered the period 12 noon, May 3, to 6 a. m., May 5, 1941. Records show further that the injured soldier was carried by his companions (soldiers who were also on pass) to Lakeview Hospital, Danville, Ill., where he died May 13, 1941.

As above indicated, Corporal Hoskins was absent from his post on a pass in excess of 24 hours at the time of injury. Such being the case, accounts for his treatment do not fall within the provisions of law and regulation as proper public charges. The law appears in the annual appropriation bill for the support of the Military Establishment, under the title "Medical and Hospital Department." Therein funds are appropriated for the treatment of military personnel by civilian agencies (when treatment cannot otherwise be had), but a proviso is attached, "That this shall not apply to officers and enlisted men who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furloughs or leaves of absence in excess of 24 hours." The regulation bearing on the subject of treatment of military personnel by civilian agencies (in the absence of Army facilities or facilities of other Government agencies) appears in AR 40-505, paragraph 3b (1) which is as follows:

"Civilian medical attendance at public expense is authorized for the following personnel and none other:

"(1) Officers, Army nurses, warrant officers, cadets, enlisted men, and contract surgeons

(full time) of the Army of the United States in the Federal service when on a duty status or when absent on authorized leave, sick leave, furlough, or pass, when such leave, sick leave, furlough, or pass is originally granted for a period not in excess of 24 hours. Civilian medical attendance is not authorized for the personnel enumerated when absent without leave or when absent on authorized leave, sick leave, furlough, or pass, when such leave, furlough, or pass is originally granted for a period in excess of 24 hours."

It may be added, re the fact that Corporal Hoskins was injured at approximately 6 p. m., May 3—that is, about 6 hours after the beginning of his pass—that a case involving a similar point (pass in excess of 24 hours, but injury within a short time after departure from the Army station) was sent to the General Accounting Office not long since, inviting attention to this matter and requesting adjudication. The General Accounting Office disallowed the charges with the remark:

"Inasmuch as the soldier was on authorized leave of absence in excess of 24 hours, there is no authority of law whereby payment may be made from public funds."

This office regrets that the circumstances in the case were such that favorable action cannot be taken on the charges for treatment of Corporal Hoskins. According to reports previously received in this office, the accounts incurred were those of Lakeview Hospital and Dr. Harlan Cox, Danville, Ill., in amounts of \$130.33 and \$260, respectively.

Mr. Mork's letter is returned herewith as requested by you.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. MAGEE,

Major General, United States Army,
The Surgeon General.

The father is not asking that the Government take care of the expenses of the funeral, but he does think and I think, and this amendment will so provide, that the Army should pay in such cases where the boys need medical or hospital attention when on furlough. It seems ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, that this family back in my district should have to meet this expense of \$393 and funeral expenses in addition. This is not conducive to improving morale.

Here is the case of a boy who died while in the service of his country and yet, because of unfortunate circumstances connected with the accident which caused his death, the Army cannot under present law pay for the final expenses, hospital, medical, and burial.

Members of the House, I appeal to your sane judgment and common sense as to whether something like this is just or not. Had Corporal Hoskins not applied for leave, all of this expense would have been taken care of by the Government and his family would undoubtedly have received compensation for his death in addition.

Let us not say to the parents of the millions of American boys in service that the Government is not responsible for their medical and hospital attention just because these boys happen to be on leave in excess of 24 hours. I believe that any man in uniform, whether on leave or not, unless of course unauthorized leave, should be covered at all times by a blanket protection placed over him by our Government.

I have tried to have the Ways and Means Committee consider my free insurance measure but to no avail. Some day every boy wearing a uniform in our

Nation's service will be protected by insurance, automatically provided upon induction into service and covering these boys even though they happen, as with Corporal Hoskins, to be killed while on authorized leave.

Let us pass Miss SUMNER's amendment and help make this good pay raise legislation just a little better. Corporal Hoskins' family and others like them deserve this protection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may reread the Sumner amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Sumner amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois would consent to an amendment to the amendment. It certainly seems there ought to be some limitation on it. If we are going to go out and have the civilian hospitals all over the country render bills, they will always be big bills.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As the law stands now, under the regulations they permit emergency expenses for the first 24 hours' leave. The effect of the amendment would merely be to permit them to extend it beyond 24 hours and to the full length of the furlough.

Mr. MAY. There is no time fixed. Would it include all time following his induction? Suppose a soldier goes out somewhere without leave and gets hurt, is the Government going to have to pay for that?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The authorities have the right to decide. Was this man killed or hurt playing baseball, which was not necessary? If they so find they can throw it out.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Kentucky will understand that the amendment applies only while on furlough.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any particular objection to the amendment, but I think the Committee ought to be very careful about loading this bill up with amendments that may work a hardship on the Government and perhaps on individuals. The amendment does not seem to be complete, but I am willing to allow the Committee to vote on it as it is.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that some very serious thought should be given, especially when the matter comes before the conferees, to making an effort to solve this problem.

The gentleman raised the question a moment ago of whose responsibility it

was. May I say to the gentleman that when the Army or the Navy has trained a man for 1, 2, 3, 4, or maybe 5 or 10 years, he is a very valuable man.

Just recently a case happened to come to my attention where three boys on their way back to camp were smashed up in an auto accident while in strange territory. They were taken to a hospital. There happened to be in the city a representative of the United States Health Department. He could not take them in because he had no authority to do so. Who was going to take them in? The United States Army or the Navy—it happened to be the Navy in this instance—had more interest in those men than anybody else, except their families. Yet the men were taken in, and somebody, a stranger, had to guarantee the expense.

Therefore, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois deserves the most serious and careful study by the Committee on Military Affairs, and I sincerely hope that when the conferees come to consider the bill you will make provision for taking care of these men when they are on a 10-day furlough or a 30-day furlough. If they get hurt, who is going to look after them? Are you going to allow them to bleed to death? Certainly not.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. There has always been a rule that when a man is on furlough he is on his own responsibility. After all, you must inculcate in them some degree of responsibility for themselves when they are on furlough.

Mr. BARDEN. May I ask the gentleman, as a practical proposition, when an automobile smashes and knocks a man unconscious, whose responsibility is he on? You have to look at the question from a practical point of view.

Mr. FADDIS. I say he should be on his own responsibility.

Mr. BARDEN. Are you going to let him lie there and die because he cannot get up and look for a doctor?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows that neither he nor I nor anyone else wants to let a soldier lie there and die.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. MAY. What I am opposing is that you will open the door to the use of civilian hospitals all over the country, as a result of which you never will be able to tell how much expense will be involved.

Mr. BARDEN. I am in favor of opening some door, because some time ago I spent nearly 2 days with the Surgeon General and the Navy Department and others trying to get some kind of an arrangement made for the boys I just mentioned in a hospital. If it had not been for the goodness of heart of the private doctors, the last one of them would have died. I say some door ought to be opened. Men are not going to go out and bash their brains out just in order

to get into a hospital; certainly they are not.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This cannot possibly open any door in the future, because it applies only to cases that have already occurred, that are already on record.

Mr. BARDEN. It does crack open the door of mercy, and I hope it will be opened, as far as I am concerned, wide enough not only to take care of cases that have already occurred, but will take care of those in the future. It simply must be done and I am supporting this amendment in order to be sure that this important matter will not escape the attention of the conferees. I believe the House is adopting this amendment with that in mind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring the minds of the committee back to this thought. We have before us what is perhaps the most technical bill our committee has considered this year, perhaps in the 6 years I have been a member of the committee. We worked in the morning and in the afternoon behind closed doors reading every line of the bill, studying every amendment that was presented. I hold here a whole file of amendments that were presented for consideration to that subcommittee. We gave careful thought to each and every one of them, and they should be given careful thought. The amendment here proposed should have careful thought and careful consideration given to it, but we have given no careful thought and no careful consideration to it because it was not presented to us. The first time I have heard the amendment read, and I dare say the first time others have heard the amendment read, is here at this hour.

I do not believe that even the sponsor of the amendment herself believes it is presently drawn as she would have it drafted. I myself believe that inductees going into service should have consideration with regard to hospital service. I think the Government hospitals are as fine as can be found anywhere under the shining sun and that there is a real idea in the amendment. Knowing as I do the difficulties which besieged the Veterans' Administration a number of years ago with reference to a matter similar to this, I would certainly do all in my power to ask that most careful thought be given to such a matter before final action; and then we will know the man in the service who is entitled to help when sick and away from the military hospital or reservation will be cared for as you and I know that the defenders of America should be treated and cared for.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Does not the gentleman think that the conferees on this bill

could take the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], if it were adopted, and work out a practical solution of this problem when we admit that something should be done? Of course, there should be proper safeguards thrown around it.

Mr. BROOKS. I will answer the gentleman by saying that I do not believe it is fair to put that burden on the conferees. I think we ought to decide right here what we are going to do about it. It is worthy of consideration; it ought to be considered by a committee that will hear testimony and decide what is proper to be done in the premises.

Mr. BARDEN. If we adopt the amendment we can change it later if that is necessary, so I say adopt it now.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. Is it not a fact that there is an Army post in every section of the country where military hospitalization would be available to members of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Army in case of accidents of the kind referred to here? As a result there would be no necessity for providing hospitalization in civilian hospitals except for emergency treatment, after which they could be transferred to an Army post where an Army hospital would be available. Therefore the amendment is not necessary.

Mr. BROOKS. I think our Army and Navy and Public Health hospitals are good hospitals and I think the service men would like to use them in case of any emergency.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the conferees could work out some provision that would be workable, taking into consideration the fact that you might jeopardize the life of a soldier in cases where it might be desirable or necessary to take him to a local hospital for emergency treatment?

Mr. BROOKS. I have not been able to study the amendment, but I doubt the wisdom of letting three or four conferees work out a matter as important as this one.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not adopt the amendment and they study it?

Mr. BROOKS. But I do know that the committee can study the matter and after giving it proper consideration render substantial justice.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not have the conferees study it now?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 95, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. The annual base pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy shall be as follows: During the first 3 years of service, \$1,080; from the beginning of the fourth year

of service until the completion of the sixth year of service, \$1,260; from the beginning of the seventh year of service until the completion of the ninth year of service, \$1,440; from the beginning of the tenth year of service until the completion of the twelfth year of service, \$1,620; from the beginning of the thirteenth year of service, \$1,800.

Superintendents of the Nurse Corps shall receive pay at the rate of \$2,500 a year, assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors at the rate of \$1,500 a year, and chief nurses at the rate of \$600 a year, in addition to their base pay as nurses. Nurses shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

The annual pay of a retired member of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps retired for other than physical disability shall be 3 percent of the total annual active-duty pay which she is receiving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of complete years of service rendered prior to retirement, but not exceeding 75 percent of such annual active-duty pay: *Provided*, That in computing the period of service for retired pay a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of computing eligibility for retirement and retired pay, there shall be credited active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps active service as contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse on active duty since February 2, 1901.

SEC. 14. Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard, when in the Federal service or when participating in exercises or performing the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army.

Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers of the National Guard, other than general officers, and warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly pay authorized for such persons when in the Federal service, for each regular drill, period of appropriate duty, or other equivalent period of training, authorized by the Secretary of War, at which they shall have been engaged for the entire prescribed period of time: *Provided*, That such pay shall be in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers. General officers of the National Guard shall receive \$500 a year in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers, for satisfactory performance of their appropriate duties. In addition to pay herein provided, officers of the National Guard commanding organizations less than a brigade and having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than \$240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are on active duty in the Federal service.

SEC. 15. On and after the effective date of this act, retired officers, warrant officers,

nurses, enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay and pay periods: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay, or personnel in an equivalent status in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and retired warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of those services, shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty and, when on active duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the act approved December 17, 1919, as amended, and in the act of June 4, 1920.

In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 percent of the active-duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 percent for each year of active duty and a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay as authorized by existing law.

The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of section 24b, National Defense Act, June 3, 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, shall be 75 percent of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue prior to the enactment of this act as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: On page 54, line 24, strike out line 24 and all the remainder of the section and insert:

"Nothing in this bill shall be construed as authorizing any increase in pay or allowance of any retired commissioned officer."

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot for the life of me see why any one on the retired list is entitled to a raise in his pay and allowances at this time. They have already been retired under the provisions of existing law. They have already been compensated for whatever services they have rendered to this Nation. It is not contemplated that they will, and they probably will not, render any service in our armed services during this emergency. If they do, they will be taken into

the service and will receive the rate of pay of their rank and grade in accordance with whatever pay is in force at that time.

Certainly, at a time like this we must guard our expenditures wherever it is possible. Oh, I know that is not a very popular idea with a great many people, but, just the same, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] endeavored to tell the Committee some time ago, if the men who come back from this war wounded and disabled are to expect to be taken care of as we would like to see them taken care of, we must curb our tendencies toward increased expenditures at a time like this in every possible way. Certainly we should be very slow about extending them any raises in connection with this bill to any retired officers and especially to those retired as a result of the findings of a class B board.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee once more in making up their minds upon this amendment to turn to those insertions placed in the Record yesterday by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and by myself. There read the list of the men who will get the most, and see if you believe by their records furnished to this committee by the War Department, they are entitled to be raised on the average of \$100 per month per man.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to have those who wish to be heard stand up.

Mr. MAY. I have no desire to be heard and I would gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that all debate upon this amendment close in 12 minutes? Three gentlemen are standing, which makes it 4 minutes each. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this under general debate, but I want to make a few additional observations at this time. In the first place there is nothing to the argument with reference to the retired men not being provided for under any of the provisions of this bill. This is a general pay bill for the military and naval services of the United States. If you will turn to page 53, section 15, of which this paragraph is a part, you will see that the bill as originally drafted provides for the retired pay of the service. This is an additional provision as to retired pay that is placed in the retired

pay paragraph of the bill as originally drafted, and as originally passed by the Senate. It refers to 126 World War officers. It is a case in which an injustice, in my opinion, has been done, and that injustice should be righted. I mentioned earlier in the day that originally about 300 officers were slated for retirement under the provisions of section 24 (b). By the time political influence had put in its work, and by the time the cases were reviewed in the Executive departments of the Government, only 126 of the World War officers were retired under the provisions of section 24 (b). They went out at 2½ percent of their base pay multiplied by their years of service. Of course, men who went out for physical disability went out at 75 percent, but those who were retired for inefficiency, based on their own misconduct, got nothing, so that these 126 do not involve any question of personal misconduct. Those who used political influence were able to stay on the rolls until we passed Public Act No. 190 and they were then permitted to retire and we put in a provision that no World War officer should under any circumstance when retired under that provision receive less than 75 percent of his base pay. All those who stayed on the rolls at that time were permitted to retire in 1941 at 75 percent of their base pay. This is a small group of 126 men who are not receiving the same treatment the other World War officers are receiving. There has been placed in the Record an ex parte statement, that was not brought before the committee. They told us before the committee that this provision had merit, but they did not think it belonged in this bill, and then, ex parte, three members of the committee were furnished with information which was placed in the Appendix of the Record. That information should have been brought to us on the committee. How about the man who received the Legion of Honor, was a combat officer in France and served for 20 years in the Regular Army and is now retired at less retired pay than that of a master sergeant? I would like to know which one of those men in the Record is the one who has the Legion of Honor. I would like to know also which one had an efficiency record showing excellent and superior at the time he was retired. You will see that some of these were retired for inefficiency, because they failed to keep up their financial obligations. Some mention is made about intoxication, but no member benefiting by this provision was charged with inefficiency on that ground, because those who were retired on account of intoxication went out without pensions.

Those men served for an average of 15 years in the United States Army. They have not been treated the same as other men who served during the World War. They have been subjected to an injustice over a period of years and now the argument is made that because it has existed over a period of years it should not be remedied, because they were retired some years ago there should be no remedy. That only aggravates the situation. This bill provides that

they are not to receive any back pay because of this provision. It would apply only to retired pay hereafter. You have gone on record with a policy. You did it in 1941, that you were going to pay these World War officers thus retired 75 percent of their base pay. Just because they were heretofore retired at an average of 25 percent of their base pay is no reason why you should not correct it. This injustice has existed for a long time but should be permitted to exist no longer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, these 125 men concerned with this proviso were mostly retired not because they were incompetent or because they were inefficient, nor because they could not perform the duties of their office. They were retired because of the contracting policy of our military service after the World War. These officers had been induced to come back into the Regular Army after the war when they had taken their discharge, and the Army went down to dangerous proportions. The Army decided that they would have to again expand it to some extent and they offered commissions to former World War officers in 1921. It is from this group of officers who gave up an opportunity for a civilian career to come back into the Army that these 125 officers come who became victims of economy. The only reason they were retired is because at that particular time we were reducing the Army. Had those same officers remained on until today they would be retired with 75 percent of their pay. Every officer retired subsequent to that last pay act, regardless of the cause, if he served in the World War, is retired with 75 percent of his pay, even though he might be much less efficient than any of these 125 who were the victims of the particular period in which they were retired.

Class B seems to place some stigma on the officers. It was used merely as a device at that time to reduce the Army in conformity with limited appropriations. Now, you are treating two identical officers entirely differently. Two officers who served together side by side in the World War, one who retired during this period is retired with 2½ percent of his pay multiplied by the number of years he served. The other officer who remained on a few years longer retired at 75 percent of his pay, no other conditions being dissimilar excepting the dates of their retirement.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I am surprised at the statement of my colleague that those men were retired because of a desire to reduce the officer personnel, in view of the records of the War Department as set forth on page A1697 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MAAS. Oh, they had to give a lot of excuses for the individuals they were getting rid of, but the fact is their appropriations had been limited and they had

to reduce the commissioned strength of the Army. Word went out to get rid of them. Of course, they cooked up all kinds of charges and accusations in order to have some reason to get rid of these officers. But most of these officers served with distinction, and had it not been for the economy wave at that particular time would still be serving on the active list with distinction. Those who survived with political influence a few years and then retired, retired with 75 percent of their pay. Any World War officer who retires now or in the future is retired gets 75 percent. It is this one little group that has been treated so shamefully.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. Were those officers retired as a result of court-martial proceedings?

Mr. MAAS. Indeed they were not. They were treated worse than an officer who was court-martialed and given the maximum fine in loss of numbers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise my voice in opposition to this amendment. I happen to know some of these officers personally. I served with some of them in the same outfit. Some of those men were later put out of the Army under section 24 (b). I cannot see where there is any justice whatsoever in singling out and retiring certain officers on the basis of 2½ percent of their base pay multiplied by the years of service, and taking all other officers in the Army of the United States and retiring them at 75 percent of their pay. I wish to correct the record as to the number. It is no material difference, but there are actually 121 of those officers now living who were singled out on a 2½-percent basis. Many of those officers were class B'd, as the gentleman from Minnesota has just told you, just because they wanted to get rid of officers in the Army as there was a hump when we were reducing the Army, they were singled out. This action was so unfair that it was finally abandoned by the War Department.

Many of these officers were class B'd for personal reasons of some superior officer who did not happen to like them. Why this Congress should single out 121 World War officers who—and I want to emphasize this point—who if there was any misconduct in their service whatsoever could not be retired but would have been kicked out of the service with no retirement pay. There was no misconduct on the part of these men. They rendered loyal, and many of them distinguished, service. We got rid of them because Congress was reducing the Army by lack of appropriations.

Mr. KILDAY. I ask the gentleman in view of his military experience if he does not know that if they had been guilty of the specific misconduct of which they are charged they would have been court-martialed?

Mr. EDMISTON. Absolutely. I am getting sick of the War Department's

coming before the subcommittee that was working out this bill and telling the subcommittee that they thought there was no particular objection to these 121 officers, then after the whole committee reports the bill to the House they come along and get a couple of members of the committee to stick in the Record what the brass hats down here in the War Department want. A mean and unfair attack against these 121 World War officers.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman believe, in view of the records of the War Department, that the Army was exceedingly generous to these men by not court-martialing them, convicting them, and kicking them out?

Mr. EDMISTON. Certainly not; they were not generous. These men did not have anything in their records that they could have been court-martialed for. The War Department kicked out those men who had records sufficient to court-martial them with no pay of any kind. They could not get anything against these men. That is the reason they class B'd them.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman wants to give them a raise notwithstanding their inefficiency, does he?

Mr. EDMISTON. They are entitled to the same treatment as their fellow American officers who served in the World War with them.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman want to take the position here, notwithstanding the records of the War Department and the records of these men, that he would increase their retirement by \$100 a month?

Mr. EDMISTON. No such case as that exists among these 121 officers.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. How does the gentleman want us to vote?

Mr. EDMISTON. Against the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to tell any Member of this House how he shall cast his vote on the matter of increasing the retired pay of the out-of-step officers who were eliminated under section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act.

Answering the gentleman from West Virginia, I may say that this bill as now written does not eliminate section 24 (b) and it will go on functioning for every officer who has not World War service. I have not heard one voice lifted today to strike it out entirely. Let me get down to this summary of cases set out in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 11. The average length of service of the officers in question is 15.7 years. Their average retired pay at this time is \$123.70 per month. Their average retired pay in case this section is enacted into law will be \$227.40 per month. Most of these officers were originally commissioned at about 25 years of age so that they started to draw this

retired pay at an average age of about 40 years. They have averaged 13½ years on the retired list and their average age today is approximately 53. None of them was retired because of physical disability. We should add that 112 officers were discharged with 1 year's pay because they were discharged from the service under the provisions of section 24 (b) before they had completed 10 years of commissioned service. We should add also that 86 officers were discharged without pay because of findings by the Board that their classification under section 24 (b) was due to their neglect, misconduct, or avoidable habits. None of the 112 officers with less than 10 years' service and none of the 86 officers discharged without pay are included in the group of 125 officers to be benefited under this section.

Following are the findings of the board in regard to the qualifications of these officers that caused their original retirement:

Of the 125 officers in question, the records of 29 show only that they came within the provisions of section 24 (b).

The records of 26 officers indicated the general charge "that the officer's record does not come up to the standards expected of an officer of his rank and service," that he was lacking in judgment, attention to duty, or did not demonstrate sufficient leadership and efficiency, or that he was generally lazy and irresponsible.

Six of the records indicated, in addition to the general findings, that the officer in question failed to graduate from the various service schools to which he had been assigned.

Twenty records show the officer to be "below average in leadership, judgment, executive and organizing ability, and capacity for command," the general charge of being unsatisfactory in judgment and common sense, being inefficient, undependable, or temperamental, or guilty of inattention to duty.

Eighteen of the records indicate a lack of responsibility in financial matters, and 10 are reported as having been retired under section 24 (b) because of excessive use of intoxicating liquor. Two of the above were found guilty both of financial irregularity and of excessive use of intoxicating liquor.

That is a summary of their record. They made it while they were on active duty in the Army. The War Department dispensed with their services. This bill will raise them to about \$227 per month in retired pay. These men will not be used as officers in any war effort, even though they are physically qualified to serve.

This is a war bill. If you want to revise the retired laws, that is one thing. I can cite you many cases that are more deserving than these. This is not the way to handle the situation. Do not stuff it in here piecemeal. Let us go after the retired list and revise the whole thing on a clear-cut, definite basis, after careful study. There has been no adequate study of the retired list. I agree with the author of this amendment that there is absolutely no occasion to revise the retired list of the Army in order to win this war. Those who are able to do duty and

are acceptable to the War Department will get active duty, and when they are put on active duty they will get their regular active-duty pay. It is not necessary to revise the retired laws at the present time. I favor the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike this provision from the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out certain provisions of the bill. A vote to strike out is a vote to refuse to retire these officers under the provisions of the bill. A vote against it—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot pass on that.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 99, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAAS: On page 55, after line 22, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"The retired pay of any officer of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of his active-duty pay at the time of his retirement."

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment had that provision of the bill stayed in which would have extended the same benefits to naval officers. Since that has been stricken out, of course it would not be in order.

I am now offering an amendment which will not affect the retired pay of anybody now on the retired list, but will simply bring the Navy into conformity with the existing law covering the Army.

It has been repeatedly stated that the Army and Navy should be treated alike. The pay bill is supposed to be one pay bill for all alike. All services come under one system of pay, but unfortunately a specific provision was passed for World War officers in the Army and did not include the Navy or Marine Corps.

Mr. HARNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this will not affect any retired naval officers?

Mr. MAAS. On the retired list at present.

Mr. HARNESS. All the retired naval officers on the retired list now draw 75 percent.

Mr. MAAS. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken. We have a great many World War officers and other officers who are drawing only 2½ percent multiplied by the number of years served.

Mr. HARNESS. The gentleman's amendment would increase them to 75 percent?

Mr. MAAS. The amendment would not affect them at all. All my amendment does is to enact for the Navy the existing law for the Army, which is that any World War officer in the Navy who may hereafter be retired shall be retired on 75 percent of his pay, which is existing law for the Army.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to carry out for the Navy what was provided in the act of June 13, 1940, for the Army?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; and it should have been done for the Navy at that time, but unfortunately it was not. I think it is the sense of the House and the Congress that the same laws on pay shall apply to both the Army and the Navy, as well as to the Coast Guard and Marine Corps. All I am asking is that existing law for the Army be extended to the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. HARNESS. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to increase the pay of the retired naval officers who are now drawing less than 75 percent of their pay?

Mr. MAAS. No; it will not affect any retired officer now on the retired list. The amendment says, "hereafter."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. It will affect those who are hereafter retired and put them on an increased basis over what they are now getting?

Mr. MAAS. It will put them on exactly the same basis as the Army, and the gentleman sponsored that bill. It will accord to naval officers who have served in the World War and who are retired hereafter the same benefits they would get if they were Army officers and were retired hereafter.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman know how much the increase will be? Let us take a particular rank, for instance, a commander in the Navy. How much increase would there be for him if he is retired on the basis of 75 percent?

Mr. MAAS. A commander who is forced to retire on account of failure to be selected would have had at least 27 years' service. He would get 27 times 2½ percent. If he is retired under this provision, he will get 30 times 2½ percent. It is not a large increase, a few dollars a month, but it would put him on a parity with a lieutenant colonel in the Army who is retired under similar circumstances.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. Under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment, if an officer retired under the provisions of a class B board or under similar provisions, then he would be placed on retired pay of 75 percent, on the same basis

as an officer who was retired in the regular line of duty for honest and efficient service.

Mr. MAAS. This applies only to World War officers, which is the law today for the Army. We do not have any class B officers in the Navy.

Mr. FADDIS. You may have officers that would correspond to that.

Mr. MAAS. No; the officers in the Navy or the Marine Corps who would correspond to class B officers in the Army are eliminated. We have a different law in the Navy. Such officers do not get a cent of retired pay, and beyond a certain grade they get 2 years' pay and then we kiss them good-bye.

Mr. FADDIS. If you do not have a class B board I think you should have.

Mr. MAAS. I do not think we need any class B board in the Navy or Marine Corps.

Mr. FADDIS. They certainly need it in the Army.

Mr. MAAS. I am not talking about the Army, I am talking about the Navy.

Mr. FADDIS. It certainly needs to be worked a great deal more efficiently than it has been, and I know the Navy has no greater efficiency than the Army.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAAS) there were—ayes 88, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may receive additional compensation not less than \$1 nor more than \$5 per month, for special qualification in the use of the arm or arms which they may be required to use.

SEC. 17. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to pay at the rate of \$780 per annum, and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet.

SEC. 18. Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President: *Provided*, That when personnel of the National Guard are entitled to armory-drill pay, the increase of 50 percent thereof herein provided shall be based on the entire amount of such armory-drill pay to which they shall be entitled for a calendar month or fractional part thereof, and the required aerial flights may be made at ordered drills of an air-service organization, or at other times when so authorized by the President. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

Any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, not in flying-pay status, who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay at the rate of \$100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of \$50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

SEC. 19. No person, active or retired, of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer, by reason of this act, any reduction in any pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to deprive any enlisted man transferred to the Fleet Reserve on or prior to the date of enactment of this act, or transfer from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the Regular Navy for physical disability of any benefits, including pay and allowances or compensation which he would be entitled to receive upon the completion of 30 years under laws in force on the date of enactment of this act.

The act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong., approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, 77th Cong.), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That acts or parts of acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this act except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay, allowances, or compensation set out in the act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

No back pay or allowances shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

The provisions of this act shall be effective on the first day of the calendar month following the enactment thereof.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 58, lines 13, 14, and 15, strike out "and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong., approved August 18, 1941)."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, in 1941, when the extension of the Selective Service Act was passed, section 8 was incorporated, and it reads as follows:

Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States for active training and service, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 shall, in addition to the amounts other-

wise payable to such person with respect to such training and service, be entitled to receive the sum of \$10 for each month of such training and service in excess of 12.

You will notice that on page 58 of this bill numerous acts and parts of acts are sought to be repealed, and lines 13, 14, and 15 seek to repeal the section 8 which I have just read. This would have the effect of repealing the language providing that after the enlisted personnel have been in the service for 12 months they may receive additional compensation of \$10 a month.

I realize that since I first addressed you earlier in the day the Rankin amendment, for which I voted, has been adopted, adding to two of the grades a \$6 increase in one case and \$8 in another. I am sure you understand that that entire amendment will have to be considered in conference. Of course, in view of his action on the floor, it will receive the very unfavorable consideration, I presume, of the chairman of the committee, inasmuch as he opposed it, and probably of the other conferees. Certainly, it will have to be studied and readjusted as it throws out of balance the sixth and seventh grades as compared with the fourth and fifth.

I therefore hope that the House will adopt my amendment and at least send to conference this provision retaining for these boys, after they have completed their training and are ready for the battle front, this additional compensation of \$10 per month. I certainly think they are entitled to it.

As I have explained to you heretofore, under the bill as reported by the committee the only increase they would receive is \$2 per month. If the Rankin amendment is not kept in the bill that is the way the bill will be finally enacted. I think it is necessary that we adopt this amendment in order that the conferees may have a clear and definite understanding of the sentiment of this House that we do not intend today to vote \$30 and \$40 and \$50 increases for subsistence and quarters allowance for all the officers, for quite substantial allowances for second lieutenants and ensigns, and vote an increase of only \$2 per month in the pay of the enlisted men.

My amendment would strike out the language in this paragraph which seeks to repeal section 8 of the act of 1941 and leave that in effect, the result being that after the enlisted man has had his 12 months of training and is ready for more substantial service, and very probably under present circumstances that means ready to be sent to the battle front, he will be paid this additional amount of a flat \$10 per month.

I, therefore, hope the House will adopt the amendment, send this entire question to conference, and let the conferees understand that it is the wish of this House that better than a \$2 increase be granted the boys with the guns.

If my amendment is adopted and the Rankin amendment is kept in the bill, then a private at the front, on the battle line, will receive a total of \$70 per month, as follows: \$50 base pay, \$10 extra after 12 months in the service, and

\$10 or 20 percent extra for foreign service. If my amendment is adopted and kept in the bill and the Rankin amendment is stricken out, then a private at the front would receive \$60.40 per month.

When we consider that these boys must be at the front risking their lives before they can receive this \$70 per month, when we consider that they are fighting to protect this country, its wealth, and its resources, when we consider that they are offering their lives to preserve our liberties and in defense of our homes, and when we consider the fact that there are millions here at home, safe and comfortable, receiving as much as \$70 per week and more, I do not think my amendment can be regarded as unreasonable or improper.

You must remember that out of their pay these boys must pay the premium on their insurance, their laundry, their travel on furlough, and many other expenses. And many of them must send money home for those dependent upon them.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, this is the very least amount we should provide for them. Even this is not half enough.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore the idea of some Members of the House who propose legislation, and by way of amendment from the floor of the House to a committee bill that has had careful study, offer amendments merely for the purpose of throwing the whole matter into the hands of the conferees to settle. To my mind this is a wrong view to take of legislation. If an amendment is not meritorious it ought not to pass merely for the purpose of saying to the chairman of the committee, who, under the rules and under the procedure and practice of the House, is always chairman of the conference on one side or the other, that you will put him on the spot and then chastise him publicly and in the presence of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Not now.

So I am not denying any responsibility I have, and I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is now seeking recognition, that I never shirked a responsibility in my life and I never willfully or knowingly took an inconsistent position on the floor of the House, taking one position there and a different position somewhere else.

I am opposed to this amendment for the simple reason that it throws out of line the whole program of this bill. What we have endeavored to do is to take care of all of the selectees and the enlisted men of the Army in exactly the same manner. Under the provision which the gentleman would strike out there was an increase which, when adopted, provided

that men getting \$21 a month should get \$31 as an amendment of the Selective Service Act. Now, if that were left in the bill—and it is expressly repealed here in the section itself—for the sole purpose of being able to present a bill that provides that all men in the enlisted service shall have \$42 a month, and not some of them \$21 a month and some of them \$31, and some of them some other amount, you can realize what would be the real situation. So we have equalized the pay and we have provided that it shall go back to the date of December 7, 1941, the date of the Pearl Harbor disaster, in order to take care of discrepancies and inequalities that might occur if we did not do that.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, but my amendment has nothing in the world to do with \$21 or \$31. The \$42 provision remains, and they will get it the day they enter the service, but after serving 12 months the extra \$10 will be a flat increase over-all.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] would increase the pay of all of them \$10, without knowing how many millions or billions of dollars that would amount to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And that would make the seventh pay grade \$70 a month, because the Rankin amendment is \$50, and 20 percent for service abroad is \$10, which is \$60, and then the Pace amendment would add \$10 more, and, therefore, for serving abroad they would get \$70 a month.

Mr. MAY. That is right. Just one raise on top of another.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman think that is too much?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 17, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. Hereafter, except under circumstances where the military necessity requires the use of persons already possessing special knowledge, skill, training, or experience, required by the Army to properly protect the public interest and when such special knowledge, skill, training, or experience is not otherwise immediately available, no person shall, in time of war, be appointed a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States who has not been previously commissioned in the Regular Army or Navy, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve or enlisted in or inducted into the Army of the United States, unless such person shall have first completed a satisfactory course of instruction in the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy, or shall have first completed satisfactorily a prescribed course of instruction in military science and tactics in a college, university, or academy, approved by the War Department and maintaining a senior unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps

or shall have first satisfactorily completed a course of instruction at an Officers' Candidate School conducted under the supervision of the War Department.

The Secretary of War shall, each 60 days after the effective date of this act, report to the Congress the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned during said period in the Army of the United States from civilian life, who prior thereto has had no commissioned military service.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: Page 60, line 3, strike out all of line 3, and the first five words and the comma in line 4, and insert the following:

"Beginning May 1, 1942, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Unless the gentleman desires to make some statement on his amendment, I think we will agree to the amendment.

Mr. FADDIS. Very well. I only wish to secure the addition to the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Merely to ask a question about the amendment. I understand the purpose of it and I am more than willing to support it, but does he not need a further amendment which will have the effect of instructing the Secretary of the Navy to report naval commissions?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have an amendment to offer along that line.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will it conflict with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to so modify my amendment as to embrace as well commissions in the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Strike out the period at the end of line 9, page 60, insert a semicolon, and add: "Provided, That the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall not be required to report persons commissioned where such disclosure would in his opinion jeopardize the national interest or safety."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simple. None of us wants to have any public information given that might be of value to the enemy. Of course, officers might be appointed, for example, in the military

and naval service, whose names it might be inadvisable to have made public, such as officers engaged in antisabotage work, and espionage work, or counterespionage work, and those appointed to missions of a secret nature. The purpose of my amendment, I think, is to strengthen the provision and at the same time to put a protective provision there so that there will be no disclosure of the names of officers which should not be made public. The amendment that I have offered thoroughly protects the interest of the Nation in that respect, I think.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I think the amendment is beneficial and ought to be adopted. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: On page 60, section 20, at the end thereof, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"Hereafter, except for persons who may be commissioned in the staff corps of the Naval Reserve and those who possess specialized knowledge or skill as certified by the Secretary of the Navy, persons recommended for regular commissions as officers in the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve shall satisfactorily complete a course of indoctrinal training, in a probationary status, prior to the issuance of such regular commission."

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that right now.

Mr. Chairman, I think you can catch from the reading of the amendment the objective and purpose of it. It was to go along in line with the other part of that section which has been reported by the Military Affairs Committee in relation to commissions, except in these technical grades they must have some kind of indoctrinal training.

Now, here is the situation as far as the Navy is concerned—and I may say this amendment is suggested by the Navy Department. During the present fiscal year until April 30, 1942, a total of 15,327 officers, exclusive of the staff corps, were initially appointed as officers in the Naval Reserve. Of this number 13,228 received training covering a period of two months to one year. Had this proposed amendment been a matter of law, 2,099 additional would have had to undergo such training.

Between April 1, 1942, and June 30, 1943, it is estimated that 25,000 specialist officers—deck, engineer, aviation, intelligence, ordnance, and communication, exclusive of Staff Corps—will be appointed. Though the Navy Department now has plans for 19,900 to undergo training, the remaining 5,100 officers will, by this amendment, be placed in a probationary status until they satisfactorily complete the course of training. In other words, it is designed to get someone in the Navy who knows something about the Navy, as far as it is possible to do so.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there provision, under existing law, for enlistment of those officers during this probationary or indoctrinal training? I did not know there was such a provision.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They have certain training, and after they get this training, then they get their commissions. As it is being done today, they are giving the commissions in the first instance without any indoctrinal training. This tries to get some knowledge of the Navy before they get the commission.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. But is there provision now where they can enlist them in the Navy during this indoctrinal period?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am just wondering what the gentleman's amendment would do to students. I am thinking particularly of medical and dental students.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does not apply to them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is the gentleman sure that it does not apply?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. Medical officers, dental officers, civil engineers, chaplains, and certain line officers are commissioned in the Naval Reserve for duty covering specific assignments. The soundness of the policy of commissioning such officers without regard to general requirements in indoctrinal service is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Georgia this question: What effect will this amendment, if adopted, have upon the Army personnel?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does not apply to the Army. We are just following out exactly in the Navy what you have already done in the previous part for the Army.

Mr. MAY. That is the way I understood it, but I wanted to have that clear.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. It has no bearing on the Army at all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. MAY. To propound a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish it understood before I propound this request that I have no desire whatever to bar anybody from offering any amendment or from discussing any amendment that may be offered, or really for the purpose of limiting time; but in view of the fact that the leadership has been seeking some understanding as to whether we could finish this bill this afternoon I propound this request.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments to section 20 conclude at 5:35.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment pending at the desk which I should like to discuss for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will be recognized on his amendment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I, too, have an amendment to section 20 and should like recognition for 5 minutes. Will the Chair inform us how the time is to be distributed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California and the gentleman from Louisiana will be recognized.

The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 5:35. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, is it the purpose to rise when we finish this section?

Mr. MAY. The purpose is to finish the bill if we can.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows we cannot do that, because there are several other amendments pending and one new section to be offered.

Mr. MAY. I was under the impression that these were the only amendments pending.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] intends to offer a new section.

Mr. MAY. The limitation that has been agreed to would not apply to the new section.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought we had an understanding that we were going to rise at 5:30.

Mr. MAY. There was a tentative understanding to that effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I suggest that at the expiration of debate on section 20, which I understand will be at 5:35, the gentleman from Kentucky move that the Committee rise?

Mr. MAY. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS: On page 60, line 2, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "And provided further, That commissions shall in every case be available to enlisted men and members of the enlisted reserve upon the same terms and conditions as to civilians, any provision of Army regulations to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, under section 20 we are putting the seal of our approval upon commissions from civilian life. Under the abnormal conditions confronting this Nation today this is probably necessary, but I feel it is vital if we are going to authorize commissions from civilian life that these commissions should also be available to the members of the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army and the Reserves upon the same terms and conditions. The situation today is this: If a specialist, a mechanical

engineer, a radio expert, or an electrical engineer is needed in the Army, and he is in civilian life he can be commissioned in whatever rank the Army sees fit to commission him; but if that same man should be an enlisted man or a member of the Enlisted Reserves he is controlled by Army regulations. He must go to the Army officers' camp, which has nothing to do with the training in his special line, and after 3 months' training he may then get a second lieutenant's commission and that only. A civilian is not limited to a second lieutenant's commission.

I believe it important if this House is going to put the stamp of its approval upon these commissions that it also put the stamp of its approval upon the proposition that these same commissions should be available to men in the ranks upon the same terms and conditions. I believe this to be essential and important. I have found circumstances in my own experience, Mr. Chairman, in which it would seem that men in the enlisted ranks could not get commissions that would be available to them had they not volunteered. I sincerely hope the Committee will put the stamp of its approval upon the principle incorporated in this amendment, and will adopt the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am not opposed to equality for enlisted men, and for that reason I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under existing law there is nothing in the world to prevent an enlisted man from being given a commission just the same as others are given a commission.

If the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, he subjects these enlisted men to the provisions of this section, thereby compelling them to first complete a satisfactory course of instruction in the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy or to have first completed satisfactorily the prescribed course of instruction in military science and tactics in a college, university, or academy approved by the War Department.

I am sure that the gentleman is no less zealous to have equality for the enlisted man than I am, but I do not want to put these enlisted men who by reason of their experience in the ranks, who have achieved a qualification that would entitle them to a commission, in the attitude of having to have this education which thousands and thousands, perhaps millions of them, do not have.

I think the amendment is one that should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 60, line 2, after the words "War Department"; strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall preclude the appointment of commissioned officers for

service in the Medical Corps in the Army of the United States made in part from among graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy, who are licensed or eligible for license under State law to practice medicine, or osteopathy, as the case may be, and who are otherwise qualified under such regulations as the President may prescribe."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman mean by his amendment to include the Army only, or does he mean it to apply, like all the other provisions of the bill, to the Army and Navy?

Mr. COSTELLO. The amendment simply refers to the Army because the original language of this particular section of the bill referred only to the War Department, and for that reason the amendment refers only to the War Department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say the amendment that has been adopted in this same section refers to the Navy. I am wondering if the gentleman cares to broaden it to include the Navy, before he discusses his amendment, and whether he has taken the matter up with the medical branch of the Navy to see what its reaction might be.

Mr. COSTELLO. I did not take the matter up with the Navy Department and have not submitted it to them. I do not know exactly what the practice of the Navy is in regard to the appointment of osteopaths as medical officers in the Navy. The language of section 20, I may say, was offered before the committee at an executive hearing and was adopted last Tuesday just before the bill was reported to the House. For this reason there was no opportunity to suggest this language, because section 20 was not a part of the proposed legislation. This amendment has not been submitted to the War Department and it has not been submitted to the committee, but I believe the language is desirable in view of the fact that the War Department is going to have need for approximately 23,000 doctors during the coming year. Those are in fact the War Department's own figures. Some estimates run as high as 35,000.

There are available in this country approximately nine or ten thousand osteopathic physicians and surgeons, men who have taken a course of study in medicine as well as osteopathy, yet the War Department for one reason or another declines to commission any osteopaths in the Medical Corps. If they are drawn into the service under the Selective Service Act, then they come in as ordinary privates and the War Department fails to avail itself of the trained skill and learning of these men and fails to utilize them in the Medical Corps as officers, as well they might.

I believe this is a serious mistake, and it is the subject of some criticism of the medical department of the Army in that they do not utilize osteopaths as well as regular M. D.'s.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it simply makes it possible, in the event the Army desires to use osteopaths, to use them under the terms of this amended bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. It is not mandatory?

Mr. COSTELLO. No. Section 20 limits the Army in the appointment of commissions to civilians, and my amendment will make it clear that there are no restrictions which will prevent an osteopath coming in from civilian life into the Army and being given a commission.

There is nothing mandatory about the legislation. It is merely permissive. In fact, it is a sort of a direction to the Medical Corps of the Army that it is the desire of the Congress that trained osteopathic physicians and surgeons shall be commissioned as medical officers.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Since the Navy has been included, would not the gentleman's amendment, as drawn, preclude the Navy from considering the matter? Should not the Navy be included, so that if it wants to take osteopaths into the service it can do so?

Mr. COSTELLO. It would not make any difference to me if the Navy is included in the language of the amendment. The original language was drawn to include only the Army, because section 20 included only the Army.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say the joint pay bill deals with both services, and as far as I am concerned, I have no objection because it is discretionary anyway, it is not mandatory, and probably they will not do anything about it. I am perfectly willing to have it in there, though.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be corrected to read "Medical Corps in the Army or Navy of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, as amended.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 23, noes 24.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 60, line 9, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 21. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act or of any other law, for the purpose of computing increase in pay for each period of 3 years' service of commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, and chief warrant officers who are paid under the provisions of section 1, 3, or 8 of this act, such service, in addition to the service required to be included by such sections for such purpose, shall include active Federal service rendered as an enlisted man and/or warrant officer in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve components there-

of and the National Guard: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to permit any commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, or chief warrant officer to receive pay and allowances in excess of the maximum limitations imposed upon the total pay and allowances of any rank or grade by any of the provisions of this act."

And in line 10, strike out "21" and insert in lieu thereof "22."

On page 42, line 11, strike out all after the word "Reserve" down to the period in line 15.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the parliamentary situation, if the Committee rises at this time, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be pending as the first order of business tomorrow morning, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6927) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEAGALL, WILLIAMS, SPENCE, WOLCOTT, and GIFFORD.

APPOINTMENT OF CADETS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the House has heretofore granted unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength might follow the pending pay bill. I now ask unanimous consent that the general debate on that bill be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the ranking Member on the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. TARVER. I object, Mr. Speaker. There ought to be full debate on that bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion in Committee of the Whole this afternoon I mentioned that at the proper time in the proceedings I should

like to have printed in the RECORD at that point a schedule of rates of pay of enlisted men in the United States Army and in the various armies of the world. I now ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. Boggs asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by me at Iowa City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. If it is agreeable to the gentlemen who have special orders for today, the Chair will put the request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHAFER of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks I made this afternoon and to include certain letters and extracts therefrom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address made by Dr. Raoul Herrera-Arango, secretary of the Cuban Embassy, Washington, at the Pan American Fiesta held under the auspices of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration at Gonzales, Tex., May 1, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD and to include therewith a table compiled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour I ask unanimous consent that I may have the same amount of time tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any previous special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an editorial on Mother's Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for 20 minutes.

UNITED STATES AND THE DOMINION OF CANADA

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States and her neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada, stand at the crossroads with their backs to the wall fighting for a common ideal and for survival. It is foreordained that, as allies, we must fight with every resource in order to succeed and that nothing must stand in the way of the attainment of the objective which means our very existence. The rank and file of the people on both sides of the international boundary, our Allies in a common cause, realize the gravity of the situation and are giving their utmost. All barriers, inhibitions, restrictions, and impediments, at the peoples' demand, are being leveled and eliminated toward this end.

The people of the United States willingly are sacrificing pleasures and comforts. They are dispensing with the use of their automobiles, surrendering their tires, and submitting to a most rigid rationing of gasoline and other essentials. We face even the curtailment of fuel oil for domestic heating purposes and we are paying the highest rate of taxes in our history with a definite prospect of a further increase. We do not complain because our eyes are focused upon one objective and that is the winning of the war. Nothing else matters and nothing must stand in the way of the goal. Any opposition which might arise, for whatever cause or reason, must be set aside, must be crushed and completely liquidated. No selfish cause or petty interest of any clique, element, or faction should stand in the way of an all-out war effort, for the sooner this war is won, the lesser number of lives will be

lost and the sooner we may proceed with peaceful reconstruction and post-war problems.

I regret to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that certain uncontrolled, selfish, and downright brazen and unpatriotic interests have on occasion stood in the way of progress and even played the aggressive role of an obstructionist when the question of national existence was involved. I refer now to the railroads, which, in their blind and selfish course, have chosen and thus far succeeded in blocking truck transportation over Canadian territory between Detroit and Buffalo and Port Huron and Buffalo without regard to the pressing need for the most direct and economic transportation which this route affords. And might I say that this opposition has been successful in spite of the fact that the Province of Ontario has agreed that this short and direct route should be used because it is essential to the war effort, but the railroads, in spite of the favorable attitude of the Governments of the United States and of Canada, have succeeded up to this time, through the efforts of one man, to prevent the fulfillment of this understanding.

Ironical and unbelievable is the fact that the Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply of the Canadian Government at Ottawa, is the acknowledged spokesman for the opposition and the stumbling block toward the attainment of the objective in contravention of the will of the people because he is doubtlessly dominated and controlled by the railroad interests. In spite of the fact that Canada only recently and by a plebiscite unmistakably declared, by a vote of 2 to 1, her desire to go full length in the prosecution of the war, here is a Minister of Munitions and Supply of a sovereign government, by artifice, forestalling what must inevitably be brought to realization, and, in this connection, no consideration is asked for truck transport which the railroads do not themselves enjoy. Equality of treatment is all that is involved and all that is demanded.

American railroads traverse Canadian territory between these same points. Canadian railroads are accorded the same reciprocal treatment as they pass over American territory. The Michigan Central, the Wabash, and the Pere Marquette Railroads enter and pass through Canadian territory as the Grand Trunk, a Canadian system, operates over American territory. It must be evident and startling to the patriotic American people and their Canadian friends to the north to learn that this one-man opposition is responsible for the loss in time in transporting essential war materials urgently needed at the front, and that the time lost via the longer roundabout way along the southern shore of Lake Erie between the points mentioned of Port Huron, Detroit, and Buffalo amounts to anywhere from 6 to 10 hours per trip, and it is conservatively estimated that there is a waste of 35,000 transportation days per annum, plus millions of tire-miles and an additional uncalculated loss in the consumption of gasoline. The savings in mileage, mind you, between Detroit and Buffalo over the Canadian route, as com-

pared with the longer all-American route, is the difference between 261 miles and 365 miles, or a savings over the Canadian route of 104 miles per one-way trip. The difference between Port Huron and Buffalo, using an all-American route, as compared with the short and direct Canadian route is the difference between 210 miles and 420 miles, or a waste in mileage of exactly 100 percent or 210 miles per one-way trip.

Why should the American people sacrifice the use of their automobiles, tires, and gasoline? Why should they forego the comfort of oil heat in their homes this coming winter only to have these essentials squandered needlessly because of an unpatriotic, autocratic, and brazen attitude on the part of a railroad spokesman clothed in the official robes of Minister of Munitions and Supply? This selfish railroad opposition, centered in Mr. Howe, as regards this question, is the very same opposition which stood in the way of the completion of the Alaskan Highway, so essential to the defense of the entire west coast of continental North America, and which was only recently broken by the rising tide of adverse public sentiment. The delay incurred has caused incalculable loss and exposed our peoples to great danger.

This same opposition stands in the way of the most essential development in the history of our country, the development of a great natural resource having to do with the deepening of the St. Lawrence waterway for navigation purposes and for the generation of essential hydroelectric power. This combined development will, when completed, accelerate the very heart throb of the richest industrial area in all of the world and will add prosperity to all of the people residing throughout all of the United States and Canada.

This identical opposition is responsible for the shortage of gasoline and oil along the entire eastern seaboard affecting the major portion of the American population. For, it was the railroads which, through their lobbyists—pernicious and meddling lobbyists—over a period of many years have blocked and are blocking right now the construction of pipe lines which can supply every gallon of need and which can add an additional margin to our Nation's security.

This is the very same element, ever present in its opposition to progress, which by foul means or fair, Mr. Speaker, sought to block the construction of the Panama Canal, a development which saved our country because it doubled the value of our Navy, vitalized the entire western part of the United States, and made more profitable railroad operations and more pleasant and prosperous the lives of all of our people.

This very same element, and let there be no mistake as to my reference, I mean the railroads, has stood in opposition to every move intended to bring about cheaper transportation and has attempted to smother and destroy competition. The railroads have opposed cheaper water transportation on our inland waterways and they have made every effort to stifle motor and bus transportation in this country and, I presume, in Canada. There can be no ques-

tion about it; this is the final and decisive count in the indictment. The guilty parties are specifically named. They are the combination of railroads and their spokesman, the Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply. The people of our two great Nations should rise as one to crush this unjustified and unpatriotic restraint imposed on our defense effort. We cannot in conscience justify the imposition of restrictions on travel, upon the use of automobiles, tires, gasoline, and fuel oil, or any other essential unless and until special privileges are eliminated for the common good.

The railroads have no vested interest in transportation. Regulated truck transport, as well as aerial and steamship transportation, has a definite part in our continental fabric. If American railroads and air lines can operate over shorter geographical Canadian routes, certainly there is no justification for the artificial impediment which exists in Ottawa and which is centered in one man. I have waited patiently for the adjudication of this problem and it is with great reluctance that I take the floor at this time, but I cannot longer close my eyes to the fact that rubber, gasoline, and transport vehicles are being excessively used and depreciated because of unwarranted, selfish, and blind restrictions.

American tankers—and more important, American lives—are being sacrificed every day to supply the deficiency caused by the useless consumption of millions of gallons of gas which could be saved by the use of the approved Canadian route. I have waited a long time, Mr. Speaker, hoping that this problem would be worked out satisfactorily and amicably between the United States and Canada.

I have addressed a communication to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, on January 6 of 1941. The objective of my letter at the time was made the subject of conversations between the Honorable McKenzie King, Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, and our esteemed Secretary of State. All differences, if any ever existed, were ironed out. I am determined now to pursue this problem until it is finally and definitely settled. I shall insist that there must be no imposition of unnecessary sacrifices when special privilege still rides roughshod over the will of the people of both countries.

I want to appeal to the press of the United States and Canada to delve into this problem and to expose to view the scoundrelly opposition which has thus far succeeded in circumventing the expressed wish of the Governor of Michigan, the Premier of Ontario, and of the great bulk of our peoples. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we cannot be heard through the newspapers I shall feel constrained to treat this subject more fundamentally and thoroughly and to recite in detail the whole sordid history of this opposition even if I have to take to the air. This is not my problem, it is our problem. Pitiless publicity, thorough airing, will dissolve the opposition. The problem is one of trying to reach the people of Canada in order to inform them regarding the betrayal of their own best

interest. The Canadian people are determined to win this war at all costs. They are giving their full share of blood, sweat, and of tears. They will not tolerate selfish and unpatriotic opposition regardless of its source.

I think it is timely to suggest that this problem might become one for the Congress to investigate. I am thinking, Mr. Speaker, that it may be well to consider the appointment of a select committee of the House with the power to summon such witnesses as Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, J. B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, Milo Perkins, Chairman of the American Section of the Joint War Production Committee of the United States and Canada, and others, in order to obtain first-hand information with regard to the stricture which exists. In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that every responsible official of the Governments of the United States and Canada who has examined the problem has agreed that this short Canadian route is essential and must be utilized. No outlay of public moneys is necessary to inaugurate uninterrupted full-scale motor transport between Port Huron or Detroit and Buffalo over this Canadian route. Every possible controversial point has been thoroughly discussed and eliminated and a modus operandi agreed upon. The customs laws affecting the relations between the two countries and applicable to all forms of transportation are ample to safeguard the interests of all concerned and but one obstacle remains and that is the unwarranted opposition of C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply. It is a paradoxical situation which exists and which permits a lone cabinet officer to stand in the way of an all-out effort in war, in defiance of the will of the Canadian people where hundreds of thousands of young Canadians are in training for overseas service and where already thousands have left for distant shores to fight side by side with our own boys for a common purpose and in defense of one ideal and of their respective countries.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] for 10 minutes.

POLITICS IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it would be interesting to the Members of the House, and it certainly is deserving of a permanent place in the archives of the United States through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to tell the interesting story surrounding the naming of a new Federal judge in New Jersey.

The President, under legislation which we passed 3 weeks ago, has just named for that position Thomas F. Meaney.

In discussing this matter I am in no way criticizing Judge Meaney. I do not know him personally, know nothing against his record, and understand he is a fine citizen; but as an exposition of how political considerations are paramount to this administration, even in wartime, the story is well worth repeating.

Four years ago, it was generally rumored that Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, was anxious to find a place for his son, Frank Hague, Jr., commensurate with the dignity of his father's position in the State. Young Hague having, if I remember correctly, been a member of the bar for only about 2 years, had had no great legal experience but he was a man of perfectly good reputation.

In due time there were two resignations: Judge Meaney resigned from the Hudson County Common Pleas Court, a \$15,000-a-year position; and Judge Thomas G. Walker resigned from the Court of Errors and Appeals, a \$9,000-a-year position.

This was the first step in the program. The second was the appointment by Governor Moore of Frank Hague, Jr., to succeed Judge Walker on the highest court in our State.

But this left Judge Walker out of a job, and the third step was his appointment to Meaney's former position in the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas.

But Judge Meaney was still out of a job, and the fourth step was his appointment as special counsel of the department of banking and insurance, at \$20,000 a year.

Thus, a place was found for young Hague, and, at the same time, the others concerned were given satisfactory jobs at increased pay.

But, unfortunately for the Hague machine, last year Governor Edison appointed an anti-Hague Democrat in charge of the department of banking and insurance, and rumor hath it that he was able to find someone capable of carrying on Judge Meaney's special functions at less than half the price.

This left Judge Meaney with no reward for his part in the deal. So last week the administration rewarded this faithfulness to the Hague machine by appointing him to the United States District Court.

Thus we see how the administration will stoop to encourage such dubious methods when we are in an election year.

I am not blaming Judge Meaney for carrying out the wishes of the organization of which he was a part. I am not

blaming Mayor Hague for using his utmost efforts to build up his political machine. But I do blame the administration for its alliance with this political organization. Politics, politics, always politics; wartime or no wartime!

The Newark Evening News, in an editorial, quotes from the President's Washington's Birthday radio address. Speaking of unified acceptance of sacrifice in war, President Roosevelt said:

That means a national unity that can know no limitations of * * * selfish politics—

And they add:

Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey!

There is now pending in the Senate a bill to authorize a sixth temporary judge in our district. If this proposed appointment is merely to be used to reward the faithful, merely to build up the Hague machine, we in this body must surely block this further authorization if it ever gets over here.

Mr. Speaker, our people today are asked to make great sacrifices. Every man, woman, and child must do his or her part toward winning the war. We should be able to have confidence in our leaders—in their integrity—in the sincerity of their professions of equal sacrifice for all—in the disinterestedness of their purposes.

The people of New Jersey have heard of this nomination by the administration with shocked surprise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks certain editorials from the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, and several New Jersey newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[From the New York Times of May 7, 1942]

IN THE NATION—MANNA FROM THE WHITE HOUSE FOR HAGUE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—A depressing charge of politics as usual comes from New Jersey on the day of the fall of Corregidor. Though only a patronage deal is involved, typical of many administrations, such arrangements project the shadow of cynical politics into a time when the human spirit and character are being urged to the highest planes of idealism. On this ground strong protests are being made.

What happened is that the President over the objection of Governor Edison, appointed to a Federal judgeship the candidate of the Hague organization. One of the Governor's abiding efforts has been to keep politics out of the Jersey judiciary, and he depended on his choice for this judgeship to further the cause. Also, Governor Edison, in the interest of clean politics, has deprived the Hague machine of State patronage. This was weakening the influence of the machine. But now that influence is revived by a mark of favor from the President himself.

In choosing Mayor Hague's candidate for the Federal bench the President enabled Mr. Hague to repay a great personal favor as well as to point with pride to relations with the White House which he does not enjoy with Mr. Roosevelt's former Secretary of the Navy, Governor Edison. Thomas F. Meaney of Jersey City, who was selected over the field, is the Hudson County Common Pleas judge whose resignation in 1938 cleared a path to the State Court of Errors and Appeals for Mayor Hague's son.

A GAME OF MUSICAL CHAIRS

That deal was accomplished as follows: Thomas G. Walker resigned from the high State court, young Hague was named to succeed him, and Judge Walker replaced Judge Meaney in Hudson. Judge Meaney became special counsel to the Department of Banking and Insurance, but he lost this place when Governor Edison named a new Banking Commissioner. Now he has from the President's hand the reward the Jersey City organization owed and promised to him.

It is a familiar set of sequences in machine politics, the kind to which the American public has grown used over the years, whatever the label or moral professions of the administration at Washington. But, coming now, it seems to have made a profoundly bad impression in New Jersey.

Among the newspapers in the United States which are conceded in their own profession and by the public that reads them to be outstanding in courage, honesty, and public service, the Newark News holds a very high place. It has published this week two editorials about the judiciary deal. The following extracts, when there are borne in mind the conservatism and accuracy of the News and its strong support of the President's foreign policy, explain why this wartime episode transcends in importance the usual political deal:

Thus Mr. Roosevelt manifests his deep concern in the integrity of the judiciary. Thus Mr. Roosevelt plunks for Hague, Hague's candidate, and Hague's brand of government against the cause of honest, decent government, represented by Charles Edison.

In his radio address on Washington's Birthday, speaking of unified acceptance of sacrifice, President Roosevelt said: "That means a national unity that can know no limitations of * * * selfish politics." Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

In that same address, speaking of what Britain and Russia and China expected of us, President Roosevelt said: "They know that victory for us means victory for the institution of democracy * * * the simple principles of common decency." Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

THE OTHER SIDE

The News explains that the purpose of the appointment is "to get Hague's Hudson machine to help reelect Senator SMATHERS in November." This, of course, is the justification offered by those who counseled the President to recognize the machine in the very special way of a Federal judicial place and reject the Governor, his former Cabinet officer, with the further effect of checking Mr. Edison's efforts to starve out the Jersey City organization.

The end in sight is to assure the continued presence in the Senate of an unfailing administration vote, which has been steadily cast in support of the President's foreign policy and the war. There are many who will hold that such an end, in such a time, justifies the means employed. And, in weighing this side of the argument, another point should be considered by those who cannot join in the News' condemnation for the reasons assigned. According to the Attorney General, Mr. Meaney's qualifications to be a Federal judge were found, after diligent investigation, to be "far superior" to those of the other aspirants, the Governor's candidate included.

Having the Department's recommendation, therefore, the President decided that Mr. Meaney should not be rejected because of his peculiar services to and preference by Mayor Hague and the effect the appointment would have on Governor Edison's fight for clean politics.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 7, 1942]

"SUPERIOR" IN WHAT?

When President Roosevelt accepted Boss Hague's candidate for a Federal judgeship, it was doubtless thought at the White House that this patronage deal with a corrupt political machine would escape general attention in the midst of the terrible news from Burma and Corregidor. But, as it turns out, critical interest in this political partnership of Messrs. Roosevelt and Hague is no mere local or passing phenomenon. It obtrudes itself upon the national scene from which, against a contrasting war background, it is inseparable.

For example, Arthur Krock, in an editorial dispatch from Washington to The New York Times, writes as follows:

"A depressing charge of politics as usual comes from New Jersey on the day of the fall of Corregidor. Though only a patronage deal is involved, typical of many administrations, such arrangements project the shadow of cynical politics in a time when the human spirit and character are being urged to the highest plane of idealism. On this ground strong protests are being made."

A measure of the brazenness of the deal which put Thomas F. Meaney on the Federal bench is suggested in the following paragraph of Mr. Krock's comment:

"According to the Attorney General, Mr. Meaney's qualifications to be a Federal judge were found, after diligent investigation, to be 'far superior' to those of the other aspirants, the Governor's candidate included."

"Superior" in what?

What was it that made Mr. Meaney's qualifications outstanding? Had he a "superior" learning in the law, a "superior" judicial temperament, a "superior" experience? None of these could be urged on his behalf as compared with other members of the bar of this State from whom a choice might have been made. No; what made Mr. Meaney "superior" was the fact that he was Boss Hague's candidate. That was the "superior" consideration that ruled in the calculations of Attorney General Biddle and of President Roosevelt.

What was it that made Mr. Meaney "superior" in Boss Hague's eyes? The fact that Mr. Meaney was amenable to Mr. Hague's will. When the boss put the finger on him Mr. Meaney resigned as judge of the court of common pleas in Hudson in a three-way deal to make a place available on the court of errors and appeals for Boss Hague's son.

Thus Mr. Meaney becomes a "superior" Federal judge. The grand object in view is, of course, to roll up a "superior" vote for Senator SMATHERS in November. The President wants Mr. SMATHERS' vote in the Senate. Mr. SMATHERS wants Boss Hague's vote in Hudson. All concerned vote Mr. Meaney a "superior" candidate and boost him onto the Federal bench. "Superior" is a mild word for it. It's nothing short of superb.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 6, 1942]

A PRESIDENTIAL "WHISPER"

In his annual message on the state of the Union, describing our objectives in this war, President Roosevelt used the following language:

"There never has been—there never can be—successful compromise between good and evil."

Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

In his radio address on Washington's Birthday, speaking of unified acceptance of sacrifice, President Roosevelt said:

"That means a national unity that can know no limitations of * * * selfish politics."

Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

In that same address, speaking of what Britain and Russia and China expect of us, President Roosevelt said:

"They know that victory for us means victory for the institution of democracy * * * the simple principles of common decency."

Except when it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey.

When it comes to selecting a Federal judge for New Jersey President Roosevelt tosses his noble professions out the window and nominates the candidate of a corrupt political machine. "Our enemies are guided by brutal cynicism," Mr. Roosevelt enunciates into a microphone, and his words, translated into nine languages, fan out starlike across the world. Then, in a quiet, private deal, he puts Boss Hague's man on the Federal bench. The wartime President, entitled to our full support, becomes a politician who invites judgment on the basis of his political acts.

Does Mr. Roosevelt think that morale can exist in a vacuum? Can sound morale exist on a combination of beautiful phrases and degrading political deals? The President demands a high standard of thought and conduct from all our citizens. Does he consider that a patronage deal with Boss Hague will inspire the decent citizens of this State with pride in their Government? Would Mr. Roosevelt be willing to have this deal heralded abroad as an example of how the democratic process works?

Yes, there's been politics in selecting Federal judges long before Mr. Roosevelt came upon the scene, and there will be afterward. But here, in this State, there is a Governor who served as a member of Mr. Roosevelt's own Cabinet, a Governor who stands for decent government, who has sought to keep politics out of the administration of justice. The President repudiates the Governor and in the issue of Edison against Hague uses a judicial appointment to back up Hague. The purpose, of course, is to get Hague's Hudson machine to help reelect Senator SMATHERS in November. Mr. Roosevelt shows that he is not unaware of the uses of brutal cynicism.

The President is fond of quoting Tom Paine on the subject of wartime morale. There is one quotation from Tom Paine that seems to have escaped Mr. Roosevelt's attention:

"Not an ability ought now to sleep that can produce but a mite to the general good, nor even a whisper to pass that militates against it."

Mr. Roosevelt's whisper to Boss Hague needs no amplifier to make it all too audible.

[From the Jersey City (N. J.) Journal]

Shocked, stunned, Governor Edison's office announced this morning that "it would take several days to frame a suitable answer" to President Roosevelt's action in appointing yesterday Hague's choice, former Judge Thomas F. Meaney, of Jersey City, to the Federal judgeship vacated by the retirement last winter of Thomas Glynn Walker, of Kearny.

If the gentlemen in Llewellyn Park were acquainted with the New Jersey political primer they would be able to appreciate what happened when the President appointed Mr. Meaney. Mr. Roosevelt doesn't need a primer. He knows the ropes.

With the President the man who delivers the votes is of more importance than a group of gentlemen who are up on truffles, steelhead salmon, and caviar, but lack acquaintanceship with the first rudiments of modern politics.

That is why Mr. Roosevelt, the qualifications of Mr. Meaney not being in question, accepted the recommendations of Mayor Hague and ignored the recommendation of

Mr. Edison, who wanted to show how he had "dethroned Hague" by getting the President to appoint Edison's friend, Joseph Kraemer, of Newark, and not Meaney.

Edison had taken several trips to Washington, more or less incognito, to help in his vain attempt to block Meaney, but the President had not much trouble in making a choice after the necessary congressional legislation opening the way for the appointment of a successor to Mr. Walker had been enacted last week.

Mr. Roosevelt, like all the boys and girls who know politics, realizes that New Jersey Governors come and go but powerful political machines have a longer tenure. The President, also, after looking over last fall's returns from some New Jersey counties where Charles Edison assumed to pose as the new Democratic leader in a "new day" or something like that, quickly concluded that Mr. Edison, as a political factor, cannot be taken seriously since his term is half over and the exit doors are already starting to open slowly and solemnly.

Roosevelt is with Hague. He prefers the mayor to his former Secretary of the Navy.

And thereby hangs another tale not yet told.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 9, 1942]

NO SIXTH JUDGE NOW

Before he went on the United States district court bench, Judge Smith was United States attorney for New Jersey. Therefore his opinion of the district attorney's office comes under the head of expert testimony. And what is Judge Smith's opinion? It is that the office of United States Attorney Phillips is guilty of rank inefficiency. Judge Smith so informed 50 men and women who had been called from their homes and jobs to serve as jurors in the trial of criminal cases in Newark, only to discover there were no criminal cases ready for trial. Mr. Phillips had none prepared. The Government lost \$300 in fees and mileage and the jurors lost their time.

Senator SMATHERS is the political sponsor of Mr. Phillips. Mr. SMATHERS is the sponsor of the act which created a fifth judgeship for New Jersey, which President Roosevelt has just filled for Boss Hague. The Senator has still another bill to add still another judge to the Federal bench in this State. The contention is that these new judges are required to relieve congested court calendars in New Jersey.

Part of the court congestion seems to have been due to congestion, or, rather, lack of congestion, in the United States attorney's office. The first new judgeship was used at the White House to relieve congestion in Boss Hague's Federal patronage. If another new judgeship is created, there is no reason to believe that it won't be used for the same purpose.

The questions of congestion in Federal dockets, creation of new judges, conduct of the United States attorney's office—all have become enveloped in a strong political atmosphere and motivation, of which Senator SMATHERS' forthcoming campaign for reelection is the focus. The objective of swift, efficient administration of justice in this Federal district has become a consideration of minor consequence.

Under these circumstances Representative HATTON SUMMERS, of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has ample justification in hesitating to approve a bill for creation of a sixth judgeship. The sixth judgeship should be held up.

[From the Newark Sunday Call of May 10, 1942]

PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS

Senator SMATHERS and Mayor Hague made a deal. The mayor promised SMATHERS sup-

port for reelection in return for the right to pick a new Federal judge. The President has ratified this deal by appointing Hague's candidate, a pedestrian product of Hudson County politics.

In so doing, President Roosevelt has repudiated Governor Edison's crusade to smash the Hague machine.

Only those who have not studied the President's record will be shocked by this. The President is full of noble sentiment and expounds a lofty concept of political ethics. But in action he is the most practical of practical politicians.

His benediction falls on all political machines which yield him their allegiance and support, and he forgives their transgressions, however dreadful. It is only upon those who oppose him that he visits the fury of righteous wrath.

That he should refuse to support a former member of his own Cabinet, a fine and decent man who believed what the President said about his political philosophy, and should discountenance his effort to demolish a pernicious political machine, is wholly in harmony with Mr. Roosevelt's record.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 11, 1942]

NUMBERS—AND A FACT

It is said in defense of Boss Hague's nominee for the new Federal judgeship that 440 letters and telegrams of endorsement were sent to Senator SMATHERS' office at Washington in proof of Thomas F. Meaney's fitness for the Federal bench. This is said to be 3 times the number of endorsements any other candidate received, and thus Mr. Meaney's fitness to be a judge is considered clinched. It's as simple as telephoning votes to Major Bowes for your favorite amateur.

If a numerical computation of endorsements is what counts, Boss Hague could have produced 44,000 letters and telegrams without much effort among his political machine cohorts. But this judicial numbers' game aside, it is further urged that Mr. Meaney is a nice, decent fellow. One or two persons have even written to this newspaper to inquire what the News has against him.

Mr. Meaney certainly is one of those pleasant, presentable personalities that so often flourish in the neighborhood of political bosses. Among the sum of qualities found useful in such an environment, being amenable to suggestion is one of the most vital. Mr. Meaney was amenable to Boss Hague's suggestion that he give up a \$15,000 common pleas judgeship as part of a deal to put Mr. Hague's son on the court of errors and appeals. He was as responsive to a wave of Boss Hague's finger as a fluff of thistledown is to the first gust of a thunderstorm.

That explicitly is what is against him as nominee for a Federal judgeship, and that should be enough. No statistics about endorsements, no commendations of his pleasant, affable exterior, will blind decent opinion in this State to the fact that Mr. Meaney does not meet the fundamental test—that is, that to be a good judge the appointee must be independent; he must be his own boss.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 10, 1942]

MR. ROOSEVELT TO MAYOR HAGUE

If Thomas F. Meaney, of Jersey City, nominated by President Roosevelt for a Federal judgeship, is confirmed by the United States Senate, he will have attained this high office through political processes planned carefully by Mayor Hague, a circumstance which cannot fail to impair public confidence in the wisdom of his selection. This White House recognition of Mayor Hague, inexplicable in view of the President's intimate knowledge of the disreputable character of the Hudson County Democratic machine, comes at a peculiarly inopportune time—when the power

and the prestige of the Jersey City boss are on the wane, when he is fighting what appears to be a losing fight to retain sufficient strength to put his own man in the Governor's office next year in the hope of retrieving his lost control. Coming, as it does, after 16 lean months, the nomination of Mr. Meaney for a place on the United States court, brings a measure of encouragement to the Hague machine.

Events leading up to the appointment of Mr. Meaney make quite clear the reasons for the criticism it has inspired. He was at one time a judge of the Hudson County court of common pleas, a highly desirable judicial post from which he resigned to make way for the appointment of another Hudson County favorite who, in turn, retired from the court of errors and appeals. It was to this place on the highest judicial tribunal in the State that Frank Hague, Jr., was named by former Governor A. Harry Moore, whom Mayor Hague has in mind for a fourth term when the administration of Governor Edison ends. Mr. Meaney, having displayed a properly obedient attitude a few years ago, is now to receive his reward.

United States Senator WILLIAM H. SMATHERS, who will be a candidate for reelection in November, has cooperated, either under pressure or voluntarily, in seeing to it that Mayor Hague's political designs were fulfilled. He needs the 150,000 margin which Hudson gives to those whom the mayor views with favor. Without these votes he could not hope to win, but the manner in which he has established his claim upon them will not be ignored when his candidacy is weighed in the balance in November.

In this latest phase of the battle against Hague, one which is being fought, incidentally by a former member of his own cabinet and a loyal supporter, President Roosevelt does not appear in an appealing light. The conclusion is inescapable that, in order to advance the political fortunes of Senator SMATHERS, he has compromised with his convictions. Governor Edison has reason to feel let down at this failure of support at a crucial stage of his fight. However, he still has it within his power to break the grip of the corrupt Hudson County machine upon the politics and the government of New Jersey, a purpose in which he should be helped by the Republican majority in the legislature.

MR. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. HART. Mr. Speaker, before this very large audience of six or seven Members of the House of Representatives, I am very reluctant to even take any notice of the parrotlike repetition of charges that have just been delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]. He is simply echoing the sentiments of a certain coterie, a modern Essex Junto, who repeatedly have been unsuccessful before the people in New Jersey in impressing upon them the iniquities of Hagueism, so-called, and are attempting to use the Congress of the United States as a sounding board for their own satisfaction. The gentleman whose name has been forwarded to the Senate by the President of the United States for appointment to a Federal judgeship is one whom I have known ever since our college days together. For over 35 years he has been well-known in our community.

For 16 years he has served our State in its courts. Four times he has been confirmed by a hostile legislature in the State

of New Jersey. Never has anybody dared to impeach his integrity, and nobody who knows him would attempt to discredit his remarkable and deep scholarship. After he has become a judge he will become a renowned judge of our Federal courts. He will take his place among the greatest judges of this Nation. He was not any part of any conspiracy as charged by the gentleman on this floor, in repetition of charges made by the newspaper to which he referred. That newspaper has carried on a constant warfare against Mayor Hague. It has been rebuked time after time by the people of New Jersey. Let the gentleman come forward in the next election as a candidate for United States Senator, as I understand his aspiration to have been at one time, and we will defeat him there as we have defeated other candidates whom his party has put forward; but let him not attempt to use this high body to attack the leadership of the Democratic Party in that State.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no conspiracy. The gentleman is simply repeating the statements of those who speak out of vindictive ignorance on this subject. Judge Walker, who has just retired from the Federal bench, was acclaimed by the very people who are now attacking Judge Meaney. If there was a conspiracy, which I deny categorically, Judge Walker was just as much a part of that conspiracy as was Judge Meaney. Everybody admits that Judge Walker made a splendid record as Federal judge. Everybody admits his high character, but his ability and his character are no higher, not by one iota, than the ability and character of Judge Meaney.

That is all I care to say, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENDER was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a schedule of the pay of enlisted men of the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a poem entitled "America Eternal" and also a letter from Judge Taylor, the author of the poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DREWRY (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for today and the rest of the week, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1143. An act for the relief of Dayee Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2275. An act to amend section 10 of Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, to grant National Service Life Insurance in the cases of certain Army flying cadets and aviation students who died as the result of aviation accident in line of duty between October 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2279. An act for the relief of O. R. Maxfield; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2285. An act to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Lillian LaBauve Linney; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2446. An act to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2456. An act to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1055), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odom;

H. R. 3572. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. IV, title 1001, par. 1529 (a));

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Wesley A. Coulter, Sr.;

H. R. 5468. An act for the relief of J. Furman Richardson;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6374. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth

anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942;

H. R. 6926. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On Monday, May 11, 1942:

H. R. 4402. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period.

On Tuesday, May 12, 1942:

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray Freeman;

H. R. 1901. An act for the relief of Floyd Odom;

H. R. 3572. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. IV, title 1001, par. 1529 (a));

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Wesley A. Coulter, Senior;

H. R. 5468. An act for the relief of J. Furman Richardson;

H. R. 5563. An act for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford;

H. R. 5658. An act for the relief of James Warren;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of M. V. Forsythe;

H. R. 6374. An act to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942;

H. R. 6926. An Act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to the State of Missouri for highway purposes; and

H. R. 6932. An Act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Monday, May 18, 1942, at 10:30 a. m. to begin hearings on H. R. 6999, a bill to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable

large channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the intra-coastal waterway, and by deepening the intracoastal waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 19 at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1632. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for the War Department, for the relief of Bocz, Allen & Hamilton, amounting to \$3,298.47 (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1633. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Arkansas River and tributaries, with a view to determining whether any improvement of the Maumelle River and tributaries, Arkansas, for flood control is advisable, requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on August 2, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1634. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 4, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Fairfax-Kaw City, Osage County, Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7066. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2119). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2121. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the Government. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GAVAGAN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 7077. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. R. 7077. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSEY:

H. R. 7078. A bill to regulate and permit the voting of soldiers and sailors in the military service of the United States of America, serving within continental United States of America; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7079. A bill to provide for the retirement of any officer of the National Guard who has served an aggregate of 25 years in the National Guard and who has served as Chief of the Militia Bureau or Chief of the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 7080. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 7083. A bill for a Universal Servicemen's Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 7084. A bill to exempt from Federal tax all tobacco, snuff, cigars, cigarettes, and any other commodities subject to Federal taxes sold to personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in uniform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7085. A bill to provide for the automatic issuance of national service life insurance to all persons in active service in all military forces of the United States, in the amount of \$1,000 to each person during the period of the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7086. A bill to provide for the appointment of persons to guard bridges, railroads, reservoirs, and all other utilities necessary to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7081. A bill for the relief of Dale McNeal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 7082. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Klein; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2788. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to defeat proposed legislation to increase the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2789. By Mr. GILCHRIST: Petition of Mrs. A. E. Steinhaus and 65 other citizens of Madrid, Iowa, relative Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2790. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. William M. Baumgartner, pastor, and 147 members of the First Methodist Church of Rochester, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 at an early date, in order to provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2791. Also, petition of Rev. Harold C. Smith, pastor, and 20 members of the United Presbyterian Church of Beaver Falls, Pa., petitioning an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2792. Also, petition of Rev. J. R. Mohr, pastor, Freedom (Pa.) Presbyterian Church, and 65 citizens, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 at an early date, to provide for the common defense in relation to sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2793. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition signed by Irene Todd and sundry other citizens of Flora, Ill., and surrounding community, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2794. Also, petition presented by Mrs. Hester Niccum-Bell, signed by Elder H. H. Mayberry and sundry other members of the Pin Oak Baptist Church, opposing the manufacture and sale of alcohol for beverage purposes for and during the duration of the war, as a part of our national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2795. Also, petition of Lucy Raglin and 63 other citizens of Carmi, Ill., and surrounding community, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2796. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of Rev. W. M. Martin and various other citizens of Ellensburg, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2797. By Mr. RICH: Petitions from citizens of Williamsport, Pa., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2798. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Commonwealth Club of California, relative to war-salvage financing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2799. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolutions of the executive board, Local No. 735, United Automobile Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., urging institution of enforcement of a fair retail price for food, clothing, and rent and the adoption of a progressive tax program to eliminate any unreasonable profits as a result of a war program, and the Michigan Federation of Labor, asking for Federal investigation to determine rubber inventories in trucking industry so that reasonable regulations can be made, if necessary, to conserve rubber; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2800. Also resolutions of the executive board and joint council of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, Local 69, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., urging the House and Senate to act immediately to remove the restriction so that small packinghouses can have an equal share in supplying the Government; and urging that the Congress and the President act jointly with the United Nations to open up a second front in Europe to win the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.